A VINDICATION OF THE AUTHORITY, CONSTITUTION, AND LAWS OF THE CHURCH AND STATE OF SCOTLAND.

IN FOUR CONFERENCES.

Wherein the Answer to the Dialogues betwixt the Conformist and the Non-conformist, is examined.

By GILBERT BURNET, *Professor of Theology in Glasgow.*

GLASGOW,
By ROBERT SANDERS, Printer to the City, and University.

M.DC.LXXIII.

TO HIS GRACE
THE DUKE OF
LAUDERDALE, &c.
HIS MAJESIES HIGH
COMMISSIONER FOR
SCOTLAND.

AY IT PLEASE
YOUR GRACE.

The noble Character which you do now so worthily bear, together with the more lasting

ing and inward Characters of Your Princely mind, did ſet me beyond doubting to whom this Addreſs was to be made: For to whom is a vindication of the Authority and Laws of this Kingdom ſo due, as to Your Grace, *to whom* His Majeſty *hath by a Royal Delegation, committed the adminiſtration of Affairs among us; and under whoſe wiſe and happy conduct, we have enjoyed ſo long a tract of uninterrupted tranquillity? But it is not only Your illuſtrious quality that entitles You to this Dedication. No,* Great Prince, *greater in Your mind, than by Your fortune; there is ſomewhat more inward to You, than the gifts of fortune; which, as it proves her not blind in this inſtance, ſo commands all the reſpect can be payed* Your Grace, *by ſuch who are honoured with ſo much knowledg of You, as hath fallen to the happy ſhare of Your pooreſt ſervant.*

But, My Lord, *ſince all I can ſay either of the vaſt endowments of Your Mind, or of the particular engagements I lie under to honour You, muſt needs fall ſhort of my*

ſenſe

sense of both; and what is just to be said, is not fit for me to express; the least appearances of flattery being as unpleasant to You, as unbecoming one of my Station: I must quit this Theme, which is too great for me to manage; and only add, that I know Your understanding, in such debates as are here managed, to be so profound, and your judgment so well balanced, that as You deservedly pass for a Master in all learning; so, if these Sheets be so happy as to be well accounted of by You, I shall the less value or apprehend the snarlings of all Censurers. I pretend not by prefixing so great a Name to these Conferences, to be secure from Censure by Your Patrociny, *since these Enemies of all Order and Authority (with whom I deal) will rather be provoked from that, to lash me with the more severity.*

I shall not to this add my poor thoughts of what this time and the tempers of those with whom we deal, seems to call for, since by so doing, I should become more ridiculous than Phormio *was, when he enter-*

tained the redoubted Hannibal, *with a pedantick diſcourſe of a Generals conduct. It is from* Your Graces *deep judgment and great experience, that we all expect and long for a happy ſettlement, wherein that ſucceſs and bleſſings may attend Your endeavours, ſhall be prayed for more earneſtly by none alive, than by,*

May it pleaſe YOUR GRACE,

Your Graces moſt humble,
moſt faithful, and moſt
obliged ſervant,
G. BURNET.

TO THE READER.

OW ſad, but how full a Commentary doth the age we live in, give on theſe words of our Lord, *Luke* 12. 49. *I am come to ſend fire on the earth: ſuppoſe you that I am come to give peace on the earth; I tell you, nay; but rather diviſion: for from henceforth there ſhall be five in one houſe divided.* Do we not ſee the Father divided againſt the Son, and the Son againſt the Father, and engaging into ſuch angry heats and mortal feuds, upon colors of Religion, as if the ſeed of the Word of *GOD*, like *Cadmus* teeth, had ſpawned a generation of cruel and bloud-thirſty men: But how ſurprizing is the Wonder, when Religion becomes the pretence, and ſeems to give the riſe to theſe animoſities, ſince the wiſdom and goodneſs of *GOD* hath deviſed nothing more proper and powerful for over-ruling all the ſecret paſſions of the mind, and for

mortifying of all boiſterous diſorders? The Doctrine delivered by our meek and lowly Maſter, teacheth us the great Leſſons of humility, of ſelf-diffidence, and ſelf-contempt, guards againſt the undervaluing of others, and the overrating of our ſelves, gives check to wrath, anger, emulation and envy, hatred and malice, railing and cenſuring: And in a word, deſigns the moulding our natures into a conformity with its bleſſed Author: who when he was reviled, reviled not again; but practiſed without a blemiſh, thoſe great Leſſons he taught his Diſciples, of doing good for evil, loving his Enemies, and praying for ſuch as deſpitefully uſed him. But how far have we fallen from that lovely Pattern? And how is the ſerene and peaceable viſage of Chriſtianity transformed into a ſour cankered and ſurly temper, as if that which obliged us to love all men, ſhould engage us to look moroſe on all but a handful of a party: and that which ſhould dilate our love to all mankind, is given for a ground of contracting it to a few as ill natured as our ſelves.

Is there not a generation among us who highly value themſelves, and all of their own form? but whoſo differs from them, is ſure of their fierceſt ſpite, and bittereſt Cenſures. Are the lives of ſuch as differ from them vertuous, then they ſay they are good moral men: But, alas! they know

know not what it is to be ſpiritual. Again, are they devout and grave, then they are called Monaſtick people, Juglers, or Papiſts. And if nothing can be faſtened on them, the charge of hypocriſie is the laſt ſhift of malice: Or if they have been guilty of any failings and miſtakes, they are ſo far from covering or diſguiſing of them; that on the contrary, the relating, the aggravating, and the commenting on theſe, is the main ſubject of all their diſcourſes. And if they go on a Viſit, the firſt Civilities are ſcarce over, when theſe Stories (true or falſe, all is to one purpoſe) come to make up their converſation. Who can have the leaſt tincture of the Chriſtian Spirit, and look on without ſad regrates, and ſee this bitter, fierce, and cruel venom poiſoning the ſeveral *Sects* and diviſions of Chriſtendom? The root and ſpring whereof is no other than a carnal, proud, and unmortified temper: for few are ſo Atheiſtical, but they deſire to paſs, both in their own account, and in the opinion of others, for good Chriſtians: but when they find how hard a thing it is to be a Chriſtian indeed, and that they muſt mortifie all their carnal appetites, their fierce paſſions, and ſwellings of pride, deſpiſe the world, and be reſigned in all things to the Will of *GOD*, before they can deſerve that noble Character, then they purſue another method more grateful to their

corrupt

corrupt minds, which is to liſt themſelves under a party, to cheriſh and value the Heads and Leaders of it, and to divide their kindneſs to all of their ſtamp: they ſtiffly adhere to the forms, and maintain all the humors and opinions of that Party to which they have aſſociated themſelves, and they whet their Spirits and ſharpen their Tongues againſt all of another mould, which ſome do with an undiſguiſed fierceneſs: Other with a viſage of more gravity, by which they give the deeper wounds. What ſad effects flow from this Spirit is too viſible; and I love not to play the Diviner, or to preſage all the miſchief it threatens: but certain it is that the great buſineſs of Religion lies under an univerſal neglect, while every one looks more abroad on his Neighbor, than inwardly on himſelf; and all ſtudy more the advancement of a Party, than the true intereſt of Religion.

I deny not but zeal for *GOD* muſt appear, when we ſee indignities done to his holy Name, in a juſt indignation at theſe who ſo diſhonour him; but what relation have little ſmall differences about matters which have no tendency for advancing the Image of *GOD* in our Souls, to that; ſince both ſides of the debate may be well maintained without the leaſt indignity done to *GOD*, or his holy Goſpel? What op-

oppoſition to the Will of *GOD*, or what harm to Souls can flow from ſo innocent a practice, as the fixing ſome Churchmen over others, for obſerving, directing, reproving, and coercing of the reſt, that this ſhould occaſion ſuch endleſs brawlings, and ſuch hot contentions? But ſuppoſing the grounds of our diviſions, as great as any angry Diſputer can imagine them, then certainly our zeal for them ſhould be tempered, according to the Rules and Spirit of the Goſpel. Is it a Chriſtian temper that our ſpirits ſhould boil with rage againſt all of another perſuaſion, ſo that we cannot think of them without ſecret commotions of anger and diſdain, which breaks often out into ſour looks, ridiculous jearings, bitter ſcoffings and invectives, and in attempts at bloud and cruelty? How long ſhall our *Nadabs* and *Abihus* burn this wild-fire on the Altar of *GOD*, whoſe flames ſhould be peaceful, and ſuch as deſcend from Heaven? When we ſee any endangering their Souls by erroneous Opinions, or bad practices, had we the divine Spirit in us, it would ſet us to our ſecret mournings for them: our hearts would melt in compaſſion towards them, and not burn in rage againſt them: and we would attempt for their recovery, and not contrive their ruin. The one bears on it a clear impreſs of that nature which is Love, in

which

which none can have intereſt, or union, but ſuch as dwell and abide in Love: but the other bears on it the lively ſignature of him that was a murderer from the beginning: and all that is miſchievous or cruel, is of that evil one, and tends to the ſubverſion of mankind; as well as the ruin of true Religion.

Another great Rule by which the Peace and Order of all human Societies is maintained and advanced, is obedience to the Laws, and ſubmiſſion to the Authority of theſe whom *GOD* hath ſet over us, to govern and defend us; to whoſe Commands if abſolute Obedience be not payed, ever till they contradict the Laws of *GOD*, there can be neither peace nor order among men, as long as every one prefers his own humour or inclination to the Laws of the Society in which he lives. Now it cannot be denied to be one of the ſins of the age we live in, that ſmall regard is had to that authority *GOD* hath committed to his Vicegerents on earth: The evidence whereof is palpable, ſince the bending or ſlackening of the execution of Laws is made the meaſure of moſt mens Obedience, and not the conſcience of that duty we owe the commands of our Rulers: for what is more ſervile and unbecoming a man, not to ſay a Chriſtian, than to yield Obedience when overawed by force; and to leap from it when allured

by

by gentler methods? If Generoſity were our principle, we ſhould be ſooner vanquiſhed by the one, than cudgelled by the other: Or if Conſcience acted us, the Obligation of the Law would equally bind, whether backed with a ſtrict Execution, or ſlackened into more impunity. Hence it appears how few there are who judg themſelves bound to pay that reverence to the Perſons, and that Obedience to the Commands of theſe *GOD* hath veſted with his Authority, which the Laws of Nature and Religion do exact. And the root of all this diſobedience and contempt, can be no other, but unruly and ungoverned pride, which diſdains to ſubmit to others, and exalts it ſelf above theſe who are called Gods. The humble are tractable and obedient; but the ſelf-willed are ſtubborn and rebellious. Yet the height of many mens pride reſts not in a bare diſobedience, but deſigns the ſubverting of Thrones, and the ſhaking of Kingdoms, unleſs governed by their own meaſures.

Among all the Hereſies this age hath ſpawned, there is not one more contrary to the whole deſign of Religion, and more deſtructive of mankind, than is that bloudy Opinion of defending Religion by Arms, and of forcible reſiſtance upon the colour of preſerving Religion. The wiſdom of that Policy is earthly, ſenſual

and

and devilish, savoring of a carnal unmortified and impatient mind, that cannot bear the Cross, nor trust to the Providence of *GOD*: and yet with how much zeal is this doctrine maintained and propagated, as if on it hung both the Law and the Prophets? Neither is the zeal used for its defence only meant for the vindicating of what is past, but on purpose advanced for re-acting the same Tragedies: which some late villanous attempts have too clearly discovered, some of these black Arts (tho written in white) being by a happy providence of *GOD* (by the intercepting of *R. Mac* his Letters which contained not a few of their rebellious practisings and designs) brought to light.

Indeed the consideration of these evils should call on all to reflect on the sad posture wherein we are, and the evident signatures of the Divine displeasure under which we lie: from which it appears that *GOD* hath no pleasure in us, nor will be glorified among us: that so we may discern the *signs of the times*, and by all these sad indications may begin to apprehend our danger, and so turn to *GOD* with our whole hearts; every one repenting of the works of his hands, and contributing his prayers and endeavours for a more general Reformation. It is not by Political Arts, nor by the execution of penal Laws, that the power of Religion can be recovered

vered from these decays, under which it hath so long suffered. No, no, we must consider wherein we have provoked *GOD* to chastise us in this fashion, by letting loose among us a Spirit of uncharitableness, giddiness, cruelty and sedition: And the progress of these and other great evils, we ought to charge on our own faultiness, who have provoked *GOD* to plead a Controversie with us in so severe a manner. This is the method we ought to follow, which if we did, we might sooner look for the Divine protection and assistance: and then we should experience it to be better to put our confidence in *GOD*, than to put our confidence in men.

Indeed such a Reformation of our lives and hearts, would more strongly plead our cause, and advance our interest, than the most learned Disputes, or the severest Laws, tho followed with a most vigorous execution: Let us not therefore repine at the contempt we lie under, or the hazard we are exposed to; nor complain of the non-execution of Laws; but let us examine wherein we have walked contrary to the Laws of *CHRIST* in his Gospel, by which we have provoked *GOD* to render us base and contemptible before the people. In a word, till we condemn our selves more, and others less, and think more of reforming our selves, and less of punishing others, we look not like proper

Objects

Objects of Mercy, or fit for a deliverance.

But I shall quit this purpose to give some account of the following Conferences. Some years ago, a small *Book of Dialogues betwixt the Conformist and Nonconformist* was published, and received with the general applause and good liking of all, who were so far unprepossessed as to consider the plain and simple reasonings were there laid open; but presently all the mouths of the enraged Zealots were set a yelping and snarling at it, and at its suspected Author: some laughed at it, others despised it, and all of them were angry: some threatned a speedy answer, others doubting of the performance, said, it deserved none. At length divers Pens were said to have undertaken the Task; but in end we had an answer from *beyond Sea* to it, which was received with an universal shout of victory and triumph: the Answerer acting his part with so much confidence, and edging his smatterings with so much bitterness, as if he had engaged with a compound of Ignorance and Atheism. At first reading I could not but pity one who triumphed so confidently with so little reason, and regrate the bitterness of his spirit, who belched up gall and wormwood upon every occasion. Yet in some matters of fact and History, I deny not but his confidence made me imagine truth might be on his side; but when I examined things

things from their Fountains, I know not wha verdict to paſs on him, who fell in ſo many miſtakes, and ſtumbled at every ſtep. Moſt of his errors I imputed to his ſecond-hand reading, for he ſeems to have riſen no higher in his learning than the reading of *Pamphlets:* and it is like, hath that quarrel with *Antiquity*, that there is not a forty year old Author in his Cloſet; and ſo much is he beholden to the labours of others, that if one unplume him of what is borrowed, nothing will remain but ſcoldings, and nonſenſe. For when he meets with any thing out of the *Road*, it is not unpleaſant to ſee how brow-illied he is; aud ſo unequal in his ſtile, that ſometimes he flies high on borrowed wings, and immediately he halts and crawls when on his own legs. I was not ſoon reſolved whether ſuch a *Scribler* deſerved an Anſwer, ſince all he ſaid that was material, had both been printed and anſwered full often; yet the confidence of the Author, and the value which others, much about his own ſize of knowledg and modeſty, did ſet on his labors, made me think it neceſſary to ſay a little more on theſe things, which were perhaps too overly glanced at by the *Conformiſt* in the *Dialogues*: and my intereſt in that Perſon ſecured me from apprehending his miſtakes of my interpoſing in this quarrel; for indeed what he ſaid was ſo far from being ſhaken by this pre-

tended

tended trifling Anſwer, that as a Perſon of great judgment and worth, ſaid, *No more pains was needful for refuting the Anſwer, but the reading over the Dialogues, whoſe ſtrength remained entire after all his attempts againſt them.*

I was doubtful what method to purſue in the following ſheets, ſince I ever loathed the anſwering of Books by retail, as an endleſs and worthleſs labor: for when ſhould I have done, did I call him to account for all his incoherencies and impertinencies, and examine all his ſimpering diſtinctions, and whiffling anſwers? I reſolved therefore at one daſh to wave all that, and to examine the matters of greater and more publick concern, with that clearneſs of expreſſion which befits ſuch Subjects, and with ſo much brevity, as might not frighten away the more ſuperficial Readers, nor ſurfeit the more laborious. Therefore I have not ſtayed to make good all the *Conformiſts* Opinions or arguments, hinted in theſe ſhort *Dialogues*, but have left the examining of them, and the Anſwers made to them, to the conſideration of the unprejudged Reader, and ſo have conſidered nothing of what he anſwers to the fifth and ſixth *Dialogues*. To the fifth *Dialogue*, wherein ſet forms for Worſhip are pleaded for, he anſwers by confeſſing their lawfulneſs, arguing only againſt the impoſing them; but this I meet with in my

ſecond

ſecond *Conference*, wherein I aſſert the binding Authority of Laws in all things lawful. And for his Anſwers to the ſixth *Dialogue*, they concern me not, being made up of reflections: It is true, to ſhew his Common place reading, he gives a long diſcourſe of Juſtification, but to very little purpoſe, ſince upon the matter the *Conformiſt* differs nothing from him: And for the juſtifying or condemning ſome phraſes or modes of ſpeech, they are not worth the while to debate about them: All my quarrel at theſe long winded Common places, being, that by a pretence of making matters clearer, they darken them with a multiplicity of words, and an intricacy of phraſes. And as this is juſtly cenſurable on every head about which it is imployed, ſo it is more particularly in the matter of Juſtification, which being the ground of our hope and joy, ſhould be ſo cleared, that no difficulty, nor nicety get into our conceptions about it. What then can be clearer than that *GOD* in conſideration of his Sons ſufferings, offers free pardon to all ſinners, on the terms of their forſaking their ſins, their accepting his mercy through his Son, and their obedience to the rules of his Goſpel, which whoſoever do, are actually in the favor of *GOD*, made partakers of his Grace, and ſhall in due time be admitted to his Glory? This being the *Conformiſts*

ſenſe on that head, I leave it with all to conſider what reaſon there was for making ſuch ado about it, or for charging him with ſo heavy imputations. But he ſhrouds himſelf under his own innocency, and will patiently bear all the inſultings and ungodly rage of that Adverſary, without recriminating or anſwering him in his own ſtyle and dialect.

I purſue the method of a *Conference*, as being both more ſuitable to the purpoſes here canvaſſed, and more agreeable to the *Dialogues*, only I furniſh the Scene with more perſons; and I am much miſtaken if the Anſwerer himſelf ſhall have ground to accuſe me of not laying out the ſtrength of his reaſonings faithfully, ſince upon every occaſion I put in *Iſotimus* his mouth the ſubſtance of his arguings, as far as I could reach them. But to make this unpleaſant peace of contention go the more eaſily off, I have ſubjoyned to it an account of the form and rules of Church Government, as I found them to have been received in the firſt and pureſt ages of the Church: But I add no more for Preface to that work, ſince in the end of the laſt *Conference* enough is ſaid for introduction to it.

I have divided my work in four parts and *Conferences*: The firſt examines the opinion of reſiſting lawful Magiſtrates upon the pretence of defending Religion. The ſecond conſiders

siders the Authority of Laws, and the obedience due to them, together with the Kings Supremacy in matters Ecclesiastical. The third examines the spirit that acted during the late times and Wars, and continues yet to divide us by Schism and faction. And the fourth examines the lawfulness and usefulness of Episcopacy.

I must now release my Reader from the delay this *Introduction* may have occasioned him, without the usual formality of *Apologies*, for the defects the following papers are guilty of, since I know these generally prevail but little for gaining what they desire: but shall only say, that this morose way of writing, by engaging into *Controversies*, is as contrary to my *Genius* as to any mans alive: For I know well how little such writings prevail for convincing of any, and that by them the most part are rather hardened into more wilfulness, and exasperated into more bitterness: Yet for this once I was prevailed on to do violence to my own inclinations, by this *Patrociny* of the authority and laws of that Church and Kingdom wherein I live.

I am so far from thinking my self concerned to make Apology for the slowness of this Piece its appearance in publick, that I encline rather to make excuses for its coming abroad too soon. That it was ready near a twelve-month ago, can be witnessed by many who then saw it. Yet I

was willing to let it lye ſome time by me, and my averſion from the motions of the Preſs, put it often under debate with me whether I ſhould ſtifle it, or give it vent: at length I yielded to the frequent importunities of my friends who aſſaulted me from all hands, and told me how much it was longed for, and what inſultings were made upon the delay of its publication.

And by what is near the end of the third *Conference*, it will appear that it was written before the diſcovery of theſe who had robbed and wounded the Miniſters in the Weſt of *Scotland*. I let what is there ſaid continue as it was written, before the diſcovery, but ſhall add ſomewhat here. In *September* laſt, after a new robbery had been committed on another conformable Miniſter, whoſe actors no ſearch could diſcover; ſome few days had not paſſed over, when by a ſtrange Providence one of them was catched on another account by a brave Soldier, and being ſeized, ſuch indications of his acceſſion to the robbery were found about him, that he to prevent torture, confeſſed not only his own guilt, but diſcovered a great many more: moſt of them eſcaped, yet three were taken, and had Juſtice done on them, with him who had been their chief Leader: and who continued to cant it out highly after he got his Sentence, talking of his blood as innocently ſhed, and

railing

railing againſt the Prelats and Curats; though before Sentence he was baſely ſordid, as any could be. One of his complices who died with more ſenſe, acknowledged, when he ſpake his laſt words, that bitter zeal had prompted him to that villany, and not covetouſneſs, or a deſign of robbing their goods. Yet I ſhall not conceal what I was a witneſs to, when a Miniſter of the Presbyterian perſwaſion being with them (for two of them would willingly admit of none that were Epiſcopal) after he had taken pains to convince the chief Robber of the atrociouſneſs of his crimes, which was no eaſie task, he charged him to diſcover if either Gentlemen, or Miniſters, had prompted or cheriſhed him in it, or been conſcious to his committing theſe robberies, he cleared all, except a few particular and mean perſons who went ſharers with him. And by this fair and ingenuous procedure, the Reader may judge how far the Author is from a deſign of lodging infamy on theſe who differ from him, when of his own accord he offers a teſtimony for their vindication. But I ſhall leave this purpoſe, and the further prefacing at once.

If my poor labors be bleſſed with any meaſure of ſucceſs, I humbly offer up the praiſe of it to him from whom I derive all I have, and to whom I owe the praiſe of all I can do. But if

these attempts bring forth none of the wished-for effects, I shall have this satisfaction, that I have sincerely and seriously studied the calming the passions, and the clearing the mistakes of these among whom I live: so that more lyes not on me, but to follow my endeavours with my most earnest prayers, that the *GOD* of Peace may in this our day, cause us discern and consider these things which belong to our Peace.

THE

THE HEADS TREATED OF in theſe Conferences.

THe firſt Conference examines the origine and power of Magiſtracy, and whether Subjects may by arms reſiſt their Sovereigns on the account, or pretence of defending Religion againſt Tyranny, and unjuſt oppreſſion? And whether the King of Scotland *be a Sovereign Prince, or limited, ſo that he may be called to account, and coerced by force?*

The ſecond examines the nature of humane Laws, and of the obedience due to them, and the Civil Magiſtrates Right of enacting Laws in matters Eccleſiaſtical.

The third examines the grounds and progreſs of the late Wars, whether they were Defenſive or Invaſive, and what Spirit did then prevail? And the grounds of our preſent Schiſm are conſidered.

The fourth examines the origine, lawfulneſs, and uſefulneſs of Epiſcopal Government, which is concluded; with an account of the Primitive Conſtitution and Government of the Churches that were firſt gathered and planted.

THE

The COLLOCUTORS.

Eudaimon.	*A Moderate man.*
Philarchæus.	*An Episcopal man.*
Isotimus.	*A Presbyterian.*
Basilius.	*An Asserter of the Kings Authority.*
Criticus.	*One well studied in Scripture.*
Polybistor.	*An Historian.*

THE

THE FIRST CONFERENCE.

Eudaimon.

YOU are welcome, my good Friends, and the rather that you come in ſuch a number, whereby our converſe ſhall be the more agreeable. Pray, ſit down.

Philarcheus. The rules of Cuſtom ſhould make us begin with asking after your Health, and what News you have.

Eud. Truly the firſt is not worth enquiring after; and for the other, you know how ſeldom I ſtir abroad, and how few break in upon my retirement, ſo that you can expect nothing from me; but you have brought one with you who uſes to know every thing that is done.

Iſotimus. I know you mean me: the truth is, I am very glad to hear every thing that paſſeth; and think it no piece of Virtue to be ſo

unconcerned in what befals the Church of GOD, as never to look after it: but you are much wronged, if notwithstanding all your seeming abstraction, you be not deeper in the knowledge of Affairs than any of us: however since you expect News from me, I was just now reading some Books lately printed at *Holland*, and particularly an accurate and learned Confutation of these virulent *Dialogues* you were wont to magnifie so much: and it doth my heart good to see how he baffles the writer of them on every occasion; for he hath answered every word of them so well, and so home, that I believe we shall not see a reply in haste.

Philarchem. I suppose we have all seen the Book, but it is like you are singular in your opinion of it: I shall not deny its Author his deserved praises: he hath been faithful in setting down most of the Arguments used in the *Dialogues*, and no less careful to gather together all the vulgar answers to them, and truly hath said as much as can be said for his Cause. Neither writes he without art; for when he is pinched, he drives off the Reader with a great many preliminary things, to make him forget the purpose, and to gain a more easie assent to what he asserts. I confess his Stile is rugged and harsh, so that it was not without pain I wrestled through it: but of all I have seen, he hath fallen on the surest

ſureſt way to gain an Applauſe from the Vulgar; for he acts the greateſt Confidence imaginable, and rails at his Adverſary with ſo much contempt, and malice, that he is ſure to be thought well of, by theſe who judge of a man more by his voice, and the impreſſes of earneſtneſs, and paſſion he diſcövers, than by the weight of what he ſaith.

End. Theſe things may well take with the ignorant Rabble, with whom it is like he deſigns to triumph: but truly ſuch as underſtand either the civilities of good Nature, or the meekneſs of a Chriſtian, will be little edified with them. Indeed I am amazed to ſee ſo much indiſcretion and bitterneſs fall from any mans Pen who hath read S. *Paul*, condemning *railings, evil ſurmiſings, and perverſe diſputings.*

Iſot. Who begun the ſcolding? The truth is, there are ſome who think they may rail with a priviledge, and if any in ſoberneſs tell them of their faults, they accuſe them of bitterneſs: but was there ever any thing ſeen more waſpiſh than theſe *Dialogues?* whoſe deſign ſeems to have been the diſgracing of a whole Party, and all their actions for many years: If then the Atheiſm, the blaſphemy, the mockery, the enmity to GOD and Religion, the ignorance, the malice, the folly and arrogance of ſuch a confident Babler be diſcovered, you are ſo ten-

der hoofed *forsooth*, as to complain of railings.

Eud. It seems these writings have made a deep Impression on you, you have got so exactly into their stile: but this is a place where Passion is seldom cherished, therefore we will expect no more of that strain from you. But to deal freely with you, there were some Expressions in these *Dialogues* with which I was not well satisfied; but the whole of them had such a visage of Serenity, that I wonder how they are so accused. It is true the *Conformist* deals very plainly, and yet ere we part, I can perhaps satisfie you: he said but a little of what he might have said: But withal, remember how severely, he that was meekness it self, treated the *Scribes* and the *Pharisees*, and he having charged his Followers to beware of their leaven, it is obedience to his Command to search out that leaven, that it may leaven us no more. And when any of a Party are so exalted in their own conceit, as to despise and disparage all others, the love, Ministers of the Gospel owe the Souls of their Flocks, obligeth them to unmask them. As to these poor simple Reproaches that are cast on the Person of that Author, as they are known to be false and unjust, so they are done in a strain that seems equally void of Wit and Goodness. But we shall meddle no more in these personal differences, after I have told you what I heard

I heard the Author of that *Conference* ſay upon this ſubject: he ſaid, *He was ſo far from being diſpleaſed with the Author of this Anſwer, that he was only ſorry he knew not who he was, that he might ſeek an opportunity of obliging him. For the things charged on him, if he was guilty of them, he needed very many prayers; but if innocent, the other needed no fewer who ſo unjuſtly accuſed him: but a day comes wherein a righteous Judge will judge betwixt them:* and this was the utmoſt diſpleaſure he expreſſed; adding, *That he had another ſenſe of the account he muſt give for his hours, than to engage in a Counterſcuffle, or to play at ſuch ſmall game, as a particular examen of that Book would amount to:* And he judged it *unworthy of him to turn Executioner on that man's Reputation, by enquiring into all the eſcapes of his Book which are too obvious.* But he is willing to ſtand or fall by the deciſion of rational and impartial Minds, only where he was either too ſhort, or where the Anſwerer hath raiſed ſo much Miſt as might obſcure a leſs diſcerning Reader: he will (when he gets out of the throng wherein his Employment doth at preſent engage him) offer a clearer account of the matters in queſtion, without tracing of that *poor Creature*, who, it is like, expects to be recorded among the Learned Writers of the Age, and the Champions of Truth.

Baſ. We have nothing to do with what is

personal among these Writers: But since so many of us have met so happily, and seem a little acquainted with these Questions, let us according to our wonted freedom, toss these debates among us, without heat or reflections: which signifie nothing but to express the strength of his Passions, and the weakness of his Reasons who makes use of them. And indeed the matter of the greatest Importance is, *the point of Subjects resisting their Sovereigns, in the defence of Religion*, which deserves to be the better cleared, since it is not a nicety of the School, or a speculation of Philosophers, but a matter of Practice, and that which (if received) seems to threaten endless Wars and Confusions.

Crit. I am no great Disputer, but shall be gladly a witness to your debate, and upon occasions shall presume to offer what I have gleaned among the Critical Writers on Scripture: and I hope *Isotimus*'s Memory is so good, that he will carefully suggest the Arguments used by the Patrons of defensive Arms.

Isot. I will not undertake too much, but shall take care not to betray this good Cause, yet I will not have the Verdict passed upon my defence of it; however I shall not sneak so shamefully as the *Nonconformist* did in the *Dialogues*.

End. I hope I shall not need to caution you any

any more againſt reflections: but as for the alledged treachery of your friend the *Nonconformiſt*, it may be referred to all *Scotland*, if what he ſaith be not what is put in the mouths of all the People about theſe matters, and truly this Anſwer adds ſo little to him, that nothing can free him ſo well of that treachery, as the reading of this new Book. But to our purpoſe: The Queſtion is firſt in general, *If Subjects under a lawful Sovereign when oppreſſed in their eſtabliſhed Religion, may by Arms defend themſelves, and reſiſt the Magiſtrates?* Let this be firſt diſcuſſed in general, and next it ſhall be conſidered how far this will quadrat with our preſent Caſe, or our late Troubles.

Iſot. I like your method well, and that we may follow it, conſider (*ſee pag.* 20. *of the Anſwer, and Jus populi all over*) if their can be any thing more evident from the *Laws of Nature, than that men ought to defend themſelves, when unjuſtly aſſaulted?* And ſince the Law of Nature teacheth men not to murder themſelves, it by the ſame force binds them to hinder another to do it, ſince he that doth not hinder another from committing a Crime, when it is in his power ſo to do, becomes guilty of the crime committed; he is then a ſelf-murderer who doth not defend himſelf from unjuſt force. Beſides, what is the end of all Societies, but mutual Protection?

Did not the People at first choose Princes for their Protection? Or do you imagine it was to satisfie the Pride and Cruelty of individual persons? It was then the end of Societies, that Justice and Peace might be maintain'd: so when this is inverted, the Subjects are again to resume their own conditional surrender, and to coerce the Magistrate, who, forgetful of the ends of his Authority, doth so corrupt it. And since the great design of man should be *to serve GOD, and to worship him in spirit and in truth*, this is to be preferred to all things else, as being of the greatest Importance. If then Magistrates, whom S. *Peter* (1 *Pet.* 2. 13.) calls *the Ordinances of men*, or humane Creatures, do force their Subjects from the true Worship of GOD, they ought to be restrained, and the Cause of GOD must be maintained, notwithstanding their unjust Laws or cruel Tyranny.

Bas. You have indeed put such colours on your Opinion, that I should be much shaken from mine, were not my persuasion well grounded. But to examine what you have said, you must distinguish well betwixt the *Laws of Nature*, and *the Rights or permissions of Nature*: the first are unalterable Obligations, by which all men are bound, which can be reversed by no positive Law, and transgressed by no Person, upon no occasion: for the Law of Nature is the

Image

Image of GOD yet remaining in ſome degrees on the Souls of men, and is nothing elſe ſave certain notions of Truth, impreſſed by GOD on the Souls of all men that enjoy the exerciſe of Reaſon. Now ſelf-defence cannot be a Law of Nature, otherwiſe it could never be diſpenſed with without a Sin; nay, were a man never ſo criminal: For as in no caſe a man may kill himſelf, were he never ſo guilty; ſo by that reaſoning of yours, he ought not to ſuffer himſelf to be killed, neither ſhould any Malefactor ſubmit to the Sentence of the Judge, but ſtand to his defence by all the force he could raiſe. And it will not ſerve turn, to ſay, that for the good of the Society he ought to ſubmit; for no man muſt violate the Laws of Nature, were it on never ſo good a deſign: and ſince the utmoſt ſtandard of our love to our Neighbors, is to love them as our ſelves, no conſideration of the good of others can oblige one to yield up his Life, if bound by the Law of Nature to defend it.

Crit. If I may interrupt you, I ſhould tell you that as among all Nations it hath been counted Heroical to die for ones Country, or for the good of others, ſo the Apoſtle ſpeaks, (*Rom.* 5. 7.) of thoſe *who for good men would dare to die.* But chiefly CHRIST'S dying for us, ſhews that ſelf-defence can be no Law of Nature:

other-

otherwiſe CHRIST who filled all Righteouſneſs, had never contradicted the Laws of Nature.

Baſ. I thank you for your remark, which was pertinent. But next, conſider there are ſome *rights or permiſſions of Nature*, which are allowed us, but not required of us, as *propriety of goods*, *marriage*, and other ſuch like things, which whoſo doth not pretend to, he cannot be ſaid to violate the Laws of Nature, only for ſome greater conſideration he forgoes theſe Priviledges it allows. And take men out of a Society, I acknowledge forcible Reſiſtance of any violent Aſſailant, to be one of the rights of Nature, which every man may make uſe of without a Fault, or diſpenſe with likewiſe at his pleaſure: But Societies being Aſſociations of People under a Head, who hath the power of Life and Death, that ſets it beyond doubt, that the Head muſt only judge, when the Subjects do juſtly fore-ſeal their Lives or not: which before I go about to evince, I muſt remove that vulgar Error, of a Magiſtrate's deriving his power from the ſurrender of the People. None can ſurrender what they have not: take then a multitude of People not yet aſſociated, none of them hath power of his own Life, neither hath he power of his Neighbors, ſince no man out of a Society may kill another, were his Crime never ſo great,

great, much leſs be his own murderer; and a multitude of People not yet aſſociated, are but ſo many individual Perſons; therefore the power of the Sword is not from the People, nor any of their Delegation, but is from GOD.

Iſot. You will pardon me to tell you, that the People muſt give the power, ſince GOD did it never by a Voice from Heaven, or by a Prophets command, except in ſome Inſtances among the *Iſraelites*, where even that was not done, but upon the previous deſire of the People. And for what you ſay of the Peoples having no right to kill themſelves, they only conſent to ſubmit to the Magiſtrates Sentence, when guilty.

Baſil. This will then infallibly prove, that forcible ſelf-defence cannot be a Law of Nature, but only a Right; otherwiſe we could not thus diſpenſe with it. But if though guilty, I ought not to kill my ſelf, neither can I ſo much as conſent that another do it: Hence it is, that the original of *Magiſtracy* muſt be from GOD, who only can inveſt the *Prince* with the power of the Sword.

Polyb. I could ſay much in Confirmation of that, from the univerſal Senſe of all Nations, who ever looked on the Magiſtrates power, as Sacred and Divine: but theſe things are ſo copiouſly adduced by others, that I may well ſpare my labor.

Crit.

Crit. Nay, a greater authority is *St. Paul's*, *Rom.*13.1. who saith, *That the powers that were then, were ordained of GOD:* which on the way saith strongly, for asserting the right of a Conquerour, after some prescription, since if either we consider the power of the *Roman Empire* over the world, or of their Emperours over them, both will be found to have no better title than Conquest, and yet they were ordained of GOD, and not to be resisted, but submitted to, under the hazard of *resisting the Ordinance of GOD*, and *receiving of damnation*, (p.2.) And it is like, the sacrednes of the *Magistrates power*, was a part of the traditional Religion conveyed from *Noah* to his posterity, as was the practice of extraordinary Sacrifices.

Basil. It is not to be denied but a people may chuse their own form of Government, and the persons in whose hands it shall be deposited: and the Sovereignty is in their hands, of whom they do thus freely make choice: so that if they expressly agree, that any Administrators of the power, by what name soever designed, Kings, Lords, or whatever else, shall be accountable to them; in that case, the Sovereignty lies in the major part of the people, and these Administrators are subject to them, as to the Supreme. But when it is agreed in whose hands the Sovereign power lies, and that it is not

not with the people; then if the people pretend to the ſword, they invade GODS right, and that which he hath devolved on his Vicegerent. And as in marriage either of the parties make a free choice, but the Marriage-bond is of GOD, neither is it free for them afterwards to reſile upon pretence of injuries, till that which GOD hath declared to be a breach of the bond, be committed by either party: ſo though the election of the Sovereign may be of the people, yet the tie of ſubjection is of GOD, and therefore is not to be ſhaken off, without we have expreſs warrant from him. And according to your reaſoning, one that hath made a bad choice in his marriage, may argue that marriage was intended for a help and comfort to man, and for propagation; therefore when theſe things are miſſed in a marriage, that voluntary contract may be reſiled from; and all this will conclude as well to unty an ill choſen marriage, as to ſhake off a Sovereign.

Philarch. To this reaſoning I ſhall add what ſeems from rational conjectures, and ſuch hints as we can expect of things at ſo great a diſtance from us, to have been the riſe of Magiſtracy. We find no warrant to kill, no not for murder before the Floud, as appears from the inſtances of *Cain* and *Lamech*, ſo no Magiſtracy appears to have been then: Yet from what GOD ſaid

to

to *Cain*, *Gen.*4.7. we ſee, *the elder brother was to rule over the younger*. But the want of Magiſtracy before the *Flood*, was perhaps none of the leaſt occaſions of the wickedneſs *which was great upon earth*; but to *Noah* was the Law firſt given of puniſhing murder by death, *Gen.* 9. 6. and he was undoubtedly cloathed with that power. So his eldeſt Son coming in his place by the right of repreſentation, and being by the right of primogeniture aſſerted before the *Flood* to be over his Brethren, was cloathed with the ſame power, and ſo it ſhould have deſcended by the order of Nature ſtill to the firſt-born. But afterwards Families divided, and went over the world to people it, whereby the ſingle juriſdiction of one Emperor, could not ſerve the end of Government, eſpecially in that rude time, in which none of theſe ways of correſpondence, which after Ages have invented, were fallen upon. Theſe Families did then, or at leaſt by that Law of GOD of the elder Brothers power, ought to have been ſubject to the eldeſt of their ſeveral Families.

And another riſe of *Magiſtracy*, was the poverty of many who ſold themſelves to others that were Richer, and were in all Nations ſubject to them, both they and their children: and this was very early begun, for *Abraham*'s family conſiſted of 318. perſons, and the many little Kings

Kings at that time ſeem to have riſen out of theſe Families: for the poſterity of theſe ſervants were likewiſe under the Maſters Authority: and theſe ſervants were by their Maſters pleaſure to live or lie; nor had they any right to reſiſt this unjuſt force: But afterwards emancipation was uſed, ſome dominion being ſtill reſerved: and it is highly probable, that from theſe numerous Families, did moſt of the little Kingdoms then in the world ſpring up; afterwards the more aſpiring came to pretend over others, and ſo great Empires roſe by their Conqueſts.

Crit. I know it is ſtrongly pretended, that the ſtate of ſervitude, or ſuch a ſurrender of ones life, or liberty, as ſubjects it to the tyranny of another, is not lawful: but this will be found groundleſs: for though *even the Law of GOD counted the ſervants a Man's money, ſo that he was not to be puniſhed, though he had ſmitten them with a rod, ſo that they died, provided they lived a day or two after it, Exod.* 21.20,21. Yet in that diſpenſation it was not unlawful to be a ſervant; nay, nor unlawful to continue in that ſtate for ever, and not accept of the emancipation which was provided to them in *the year of Jubily*. Neither is this ſtate declared unlawful under the Goſpel, ſince *S. Paul* ſaith, 1 *Cor.* 7. 21. *Art thou called being a ſervant, care not for it: but if thou mayſt be free,*

free, use it rather: By which we see the Gospel doth not emancipate servants, but placeth that state among things which may be lawfully submitted to, though liberty be preferable.

Basil. From this it may be well inferred, that if a Society have so intirely surrendred themselves that they are in no better case than were the servants among the *Romans* or *Hebrews*, the thing is not unlawful; nor can they make it void, or resume the freedom without his consent whose servants they are: and as *S. Peter* tells, 1 *Pet.*2.18. *The servants to submit to their Masters, tho punishing them wrongfully.* By whom all know that he means not of hired, but of bought servants: so if a people be under any degrees of that state, they ought to submit, not only to the good, but to the froward: and still it appears that the Sword is only in the Magistrates hand, and that the people have no claim to it. It is true, in case the Magistrate be furious, or desert his right, or expose his Kingdoms to the fury of others, the Laws and Sense of all Nations agree, that the States of the Land are to be the Administrators of the power, till he recover himself: But the instance of *Nebuchadnezzar*, *Dan.*4.26. shews, that still the Kingdom should be sure to him when he recovers.

Ubi. Now you begin to yield to truth, and con-

confeſs, that a Magiſtrate, when he groſly abuſeth his Power, may be coërced: this then ſhews that the People are not ſlaves.

Baſil. The Caſe varies very much when the abuſe is ſuch that it tends to a total Subverſion, which may be called juſtly *a Phrenſie*, ſince no man is capable of it till he be under ſome leſion of his mind; in which caſe, the Power is to be adminiſtred by others, for the Prince and his Peoples ſafety: But this will never prove that a Magiſtrate governing by Law, though there be great errors in his Government, ought to be coërced: otherwiſe you muſt open a door to perpetual Broils, ſince every one by theſe Maxims becomes Judge; and where he is both Judge and Party, he is not like to be caſt in his Pretenſions: And even few Malefactors die, but they think hard meaſure is given them. If then forcible ſelf-defence be to be followed, none of theſe ſhould yield up their Lives without uſing all attempts for reſcuing them.

Eud. Whatever other Caſes allow of, certainly the defence of Religion by Arms is never to be admitted: for the nature of Chriſtian Religion is ſuch, that it excludes all carnal Weapons from its defence. And when I conſider how expreſly *CHRIST forbids his diſciples to reſiſt evil*, *Matth.* 25. 39. how ſeverely that reſiſtance is condemned by S. *Paul*, and that *condemnation* is

declared the Puniſhment of it, I am forced to cry out, Oh! what times have we fallen in, in which men dare againſt the expreſs Laws of the Goſpel, defend that practice upon which GOD hath paſſed this condemnation, *If whoſoever break the leaſt of theſe Commandments, and teach men ſo to do, ſhall be called the leaſt in the Kingdom of GOD:* What ſhall their portion be who teach men to break one *of the greateſt of theſe Commandments,* ſuch as are the Laws of Peace and Subjection? And what may we not look for from ſuch Teachers, who dare tax that glorious Doctrine of patient Suffering, as brutiſh and irrational, and though it be expreſly ſaid, 1 *Pet.* 2. 21. *That CHRIST by ſuffering for us, left us his Example how to follow his ſteps,* which was followed by a glorious Cloud of Witneſſes? Yet in theſe laſt days, what a brood hath ſprung up, *Of men who are lovers of their own ſelves, traytors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleaſures, more than lovers of GOD: having a form of godlineſs, but denying the power thereof; who creep into houſes, and lead captive ſilly women laden with ſin?* It is our ſins that provoke GOD to open the *bottomleſs pit,* and let looſe ſuch *locuſts*; but were we turning to GOD, and repenting of the works of our hands, we might hope that their power ſhould be taken from them, and that their folly ſhould be made known to all men.

Iſai.

Isot. Who talk bigly now? But let Reason and Scripture take place, and you shall find good warrants in the *Old Testament* for coërcing the Magistrate, and subjecting the power in the Peoples hands, (*see p.* 12.) for the People were warranted to *punish Idolaters*, *Deut.* 13. 12. And from the beginning of *Deuteronomy*, it appears that Book was directed to all *Israel*, therefore any might have punished Idolaters; therefore the power of Reforming is with the People: And again (*see p.* 13.) the *Law of the King* is set down, *Deut.* 18. 14. which gives a clear Evidence, that the People might coërce him: Otherwise why was that Law delivered to the People?

Crit. I am much deceived if these Instances do conclude for your design, since the utmost they can prove, is, that some share of the executive power lay in the hands of the People among the *Jews*; but that proves nothing: where by Law and Practice it is clear the power is wholly in the hands of Superior unaccountable Magistrates. But that the Law of the King, or of punishing Idolaters was delivered to the People, proves not that they must execute it: For the Law of Sacrifices, and all the Temple worship was also delivered to them: but I hope you will not from that infer, that the People were to judge in these matters, or to give Laws to their Priests; neither will the Law, because addressed

to the People, prove themſelves to be the executors of it; otherwiſe the *Epiſtle to the Corinthians* addreſſed *to all the Saints in Corinth*, will prove the People the *Judges of Excommunication*, and *of the Rules of Church-worſhip*, which are there delivered: ſo that though the Law was directed to all the People, yet that proves not that every precept of it concerned all the People, but that the whole of the Law was addreſſed to the whole People, and the reſpective parts of it, to all the individuals, according to their ſeveral ſtations: And after all this, you are to conſider that ſome things were allowed by that Law to private Perſons, which ought never to be made precedents: for the Law allowed the Friends of one that was killed by chance, to avenge the Blood on the Perſon that ſlew him, if he kept not within the City of Refuge: but that being a particular proviſion of their Judicial and Municipal Law, will be no warrant for ſuch revenge in other States.

Iſot. But what ſay you to the revolt of *Libnah*, 2 *Chron.* 21. 10 which revolted from *Jehoram*, becauſe he *forſook the* LORD GOD *of his fathers:* And of *Amaziah*, 2 *Chron.* 25. 27. who when he turned away from following the LORD, his being killed by a Conſpiracy of theſe in *Jeruſalem*, and the *fourſcore valiant Prieſts* who withſtood *Uzziah*, when he went to offer

offer incenſe? 2 *Chron.* 26. 17. *See p.* 13, 14.

Crit. As for your inſtances, conſider that many things are ſet down in the *Old Teſtament*, that are undoubted faults, and yet ſo far are they from being taxed, that they rather ſeem to be applauded: ſo it is in the caſe of the *Midwives lie*, not to mention the *Polygamy of the Patriarchs*; therefore it not being clear to us by what ſpecial warrants they acted, a Practice of that Diſpenſation will be no precedent to us. But for that of *Libnah*, it may be juſtly doubted if the *Libnah* there mentioned, be that City which was aſſigned to the *Prieſts*: for *Numbers* 33. 20. we meet with a *Libnah* in the journyings of *Iſrael*; and both the *Syriack* and the *Arabick verſion*, have underſtood the place of that City; for they render it, the *Idumeans that dwelt at Libnah*. But whatever be in this, the particle *becauſe*, doth not always import the deſign of the doer: which if you examine the *Hebrew*, will be very clear; and I ſhall name but one place to ſatisfie you, 1 *Sam.* 2. 25. *Elies ſons hearkned not to the voice of their father, becauſe the* LORD *would ſlay them.* But, I doubt not, you will confeſs this was not their motive to ſuch diſobedience: ſo this will import no more, but that GOD in his Providence permitted that revolt for a Puniſhment of *Jehoram*'s Apoſtaſie: neither will fair Pretences juſtifie bad Actions:

ſo the utmoſt that place can prove, is, that they made that their pretence. But that their revolt could not be without they had alſo revolted from GOD, will appear from this, that the Prieſts were bound to give attendance by turns at the Temple, ſo none of them could have revolted from the King without their rejecting of GOD'S Service, as long as the King was Maſter of *Jeruſalem*, whither no doubt they would not have come during their revolt.

As for your inſtance of *Amaziah*, I confeſs it is plain dealing, and you diſcloſe the *Myſtery of defenſive Arms*, that it is but lamely maintain'd, till the Doctrine of murdering of Kings be alſo aſſerted: And indeed your Friend by this ingenuity of his, hath done that Cauſe a prejudice, of which many are ſufficiently ſenſible; for this was a ſecret Doctrine to be inſtilled in corners, in the hearts of Diſciples duly prepared for it, but not to be owned to the World: For if that place prove any thing, it will prove that when a King turns from following the LORD, his Subjects may conſpire and ſlay him; how this would take among the *Fifth Monarchy Men*, I know not; but I am ſure it will be abhorred by all *Proteſtants*: and particularly by theſe who made it an Article of their Confeſſion of Faith, That infidelity or difference of Religion, doth not make void the Magiſtrates juſt power: there-

Therefore this being a direct Breach of both fifth and ſixth Commands, though it be neither marked as condemned, nor puniſhed in that ſhort account there given, yet it will never warrant the reſiſting the Ordinance of GOD, upon which GOD hath entailed Damnation. And whereas your Friend alledgeth the juſtice of this may be evinced from Scripture, it ſhews that in his Judgment, not only Tyranny, but the turning from following GOD, is a juſt cauſe for conſpiring againſt, and killing of Kings: But I cannot ſee where he finds what the cauſe of this Conſpiracy was, ſince the Text taxeth only the time, but not the cauſe of it.

And for the inſtance of *Uzziah*, the Prieſts indeed withſtood him, as they ought to have done, as the Miniſters of the Goſpel ought yet to do, if a King would go and conſecrate the LORD'S Supper: but their withſtanding of that, imports no violent Oppoſition; the ſtrict ſignification of the word being only, that they *placed themſelves over againſt him*, and ſo it is rendered by the *LXX. Interpreters*; and remember *that S.*Paul *withſtood S.* Peter *to his face*, *Gal.* 2. 11. Yet I do not apprehend you will ſuſpect he uſed force. As for what follows, that the Prieſts *did thruſt him out*, it will not prove they laid hands on him, that word ſignifying only, *that they made him haſte out of the*

Temple: and is the ſame word which *Eſther* 6. 14. is rendered, *haſted*, where none will think that the Chamberlains laid violent hands on *Haman*: ſo all that the Prieſts did, was to charge *Uzziah*, when his Leproſie appeared, to get him quickly out of the Temple: and ſome Copies of the *LXX.* have it ſo rendered: and the following words ſhew there was no need of uſing force, ſince himſelf made haſte. And for the word rendered *valiant*, or *ſons of valor*, that word is not always taken for *valor*, but ſometimes for *activity*; ſo *Gen.* 47. 6. ſometimes for *riches*, ſo *Ruth* 2. 1. It is alſo rendered *wealth*, *Gen.* 34. 29. ſo this will not prove that *Azariah* made choice of theſe men for the ſtrength of their Body, but for the Reſolution of their Mind, that they might ſtoutly contradict *Uzziah*; and thus you have drawn a great deal more from me than I intended, or theſe miſapplied places needed, for clearing of them from the deſign you had upon them.

Iſot. But is it not clear from 1 *Sam.* 14. 45. that *the people of Iſrael reſcued* Jonathan *from his fathers bloody ſentence againſt him, and ſwore he ſhould not die? See pag.* 15.

Crit. That will prove as little; for no force was uſed in the matter, only a ſolemn Proteſtation was made. Next, the word rendered, *reſcued*, is, *redeemed*, which is not uſed in a ſenſe that

that imports violence in Scripture: but rather for a *thing done by contract and agreement:* And the *LXX. Interpreters* render it, *the people intreated for Jonathan:* nor need we doubt but *Saul* was easily prevailed upon to yield to their desire. Besides any King that would murder his eldest Son and heir of his Crown upon so bare a pretence, after he had signalized his courage so notably, as *Jonathan* did, may well be looked upon as one that is furious; and so the holding of his hands, is very far different from the case of defensive Arms.

Ist. But *David, a man according to* GODS *heart, gathered four hundred Men about him, and stood to his defence, when cruelly persecuted by* Saul, 1 *Sam.* 22. 2.

Basil. Many things meet in this instance to take away any colour of an argument might be drawn from it: for *David* was by GODS command designed successor to the Crown, and so was no ordinary Subject. Next, *Saul* was become furious, and an evil spirit seized on him, so that in his rage he threw Javelins, not only at *David*, but at his Son *Jonathan.* Now all confess, that when a Sovereign is frenetick, his fury may be restrained. Further, we see how far *David* was from resistance, he standing on a pure defence, so that when he had *Saul* in his power twice, he would do him no hurt; yea, *his heart*

smote

ſmote him when he cut off the hem of his garment, 1 *Sam.* 24. 4, 5. This was not like ſome you know of, who ſet Guards about their King (for the ſecurity of his Perſon forſooth) when he had truſted himſelf into their hands. And it is very doubtful if *David*'s gathering that force about him was lawful; for theſe who came to him were naughty Men, and diſcontented and broken with debt; whereas had that been a juſtifiable practice, it is like he ſhould have had another kind of following. And his offering his ſervice to the *Philiſtins*, who were Enemies to GOD, to fight for them againſt the people of GOD, is a thing which can admit of no excuſe. But after all this, if the actions even of renowned Perſons in the Old Diſpenſation be Precedents, you may adduce the inſtances of *Ehud*, to prove that we may ſecretly aſſaſſinate a Tyrant; and of *Jael*, to prove that after we have offered protection to one who upon that truſts to us, we may ſecretly murder him.

Iſot. But what ſay you to the reſiſtance uſed by *Mattathias*, and his Children, who killed the Kings Officers, and armed againſt him? which reſiſtance, as it was foretold by *Daniel*, ſo it is ſaid by the Author of the *Epiſtle* to the *Hebrews*, That *by faith they waxed valiant in fight, and turned to flight the Armies of Aliens:* which by all is applied to the *Maccabees*. And who

are

are you to condemn that which the holy Ghoſt calls *the work of faith* in them? *See p.* 18, 19.

Baſil. I ſee *Criticus* is weary of ſpeaking, and therefore will relieve him for this once, and tell you, that the title *Antiochus* had to command the *Jews*, is not undoubted: for *Joſephus* lib. 12. cap. 7. and 8. ſhews how the *Jewiſh* Nation was toſſed betwixt hands, and ſometimes in the power of the Kings of *Egypt*, and ſometimes of *Syria*; and that the factions among the *Jews*, gave the occaſion to their being ſo invaded; for ambitious pretenders to the High Prieſthood, ſought the favour of theſe Kings, and ſo ſacrificed the intereſts both of Religion, and their Country to their own baſe ends: which was the caſe in *Antiochus Epiphanes* his time, who after his attempt upon *Egypt*, came againſt *Jeruſalem*, to which he was admitted by the men of his party, who opened the gates to him: after which, he polluted their worſhip and Temple, and fell on the cruelleſt perſecution imaginable. Now his title over them being ſo ill grounded, their aſſerting their freedom and Religion againſt that cruel and unjuſt Invader, was not of the nature of Subjects reſiſting their Sovereign. Beſides, what is brought from the *Epiſtle* to the *Hebrews* ch. 11. for juſtifying theſe Wars, ſeems ill applied: for from the end of the 32. *verſe*, it appears he only ſpeaks there of what was done

done in the times of the Prophets, and none of these being during the time of the *Maccabees*, that is not applicable to them. Next, as for *Mattathias*, I must tell you that GOD often raised up extraordinary persons to judg *Israel*, whose practices must be no rule to us: for GOD sets up Kings and Rulers at his pleasure: and in the Old Dispensation he frequently sent extraordinary Persons to do extraordinary things, who were called *Zealots*: and such was *Samuel*'s hewing *Agag* in pieces before the Lord, *Elijah*'s causing to kill the Priests of *Baal*, which was not done upon the peoples power to kill Idolaters: but *Elijah* having by that signal Miracle of fire falling from heaven, proved both that GOD was the LORD, and onely to be worshiped, and that he was his Prophet, and commanding these Priests to be killed, he was to be obeyed. Of the same nature was his praying for fire from heaven on the Captains who came to take him, and *Elisha* his curling of the Children who reproached him. From these Precedents we see it is apparent that often in the Old Dispensation, the power of the Sword, both ordinary and extraordinary, was assumed by persons sent of GOD, which will never warrant private and ordinary uninspired Persons to do the like.

Ifot. I acknowledg this hath some ground; but the first instance of these *Zealots*, was *Phinehas*,

in

in whom we find no veſtige of an extraordinary miſſion, and yet he killed *Zimri* and *Cosbi*, for which he was rewarded with an everlaſting Prieſthood: So a zeal for GOD in extraordinary caſes, ſeems warrant enough for extraordinary practices. *Pag.* 382. *to* 405.

Baſil. If you will read the account of that action given by *Moſes*, it will clear you of all your miſtakes: ſince *Phinehas* had the warrant of the Magiſtrate for all he did; for *Moſes* being then the Perſon in whoſe hands the Civil Power was committed by GOD, did ſay to the Judges of *Iſrael*, *Numb.* 25. 5. *Slay ye every one his men that were joyned to Baal Peor.* Now that *Phinehas* was a Judg in *Iſrael* at that time, is not to be doubted; for *Eleazer* was then High Prieſt, and by that means exempted from that Authority, which when his Father *Aaron* lived, was in his hand, *Numb.* 3. 32. and he being now in his Fathers place, there is no ground to doubt but *Phinehas* was alſo in his, and ſo as one of the Judges, he had received command from *Moſes* to execute judgment on theſe impure Idolaters, which he did with ſo much noble zeal, that the Plague was ſtayed, and GOD'S wrath turned away. But if this conclude a Precedent, it will prove too much, both that a Church-man may execute judgment, and that a private perſon in the ſight of a holy Magiſtrate, without waiting

ing for his Justice, may go and punish Crimes. From the instances adduced, it will appear how *Zealots* were ordinarily raised up in that Dispensation: But when two of CHRISTS Disciples lay claim to that priviledg of praying for fire from heaven, he gives check to the fervor of their thundring zeal, and tells them, *Luk.* 9. 55, 56. *You know not what spirit you are of*: adding, that *the Son of man was not come to destroy mens lives, but to save them:* whereby he shews that tho in the Old Dispensation, *GOD* having by his own command given his people a title to invade the Nations of *Canaan*, and extirpate them, having also given them Political Laws for the administration of Justice, and order among them, it was proper for that time that *GOD* should raise up Judges to work extraordinary deliverances to his People, whose Example we are not now to imitate: *GOD* also sent Prophets, who had it sometimes in Commission to execute Justice on Transgressors; yet in the New Dispensation, these things were not to take place, where we have no temporal *Canaan*, nor Judicial Laws given us; and consequently none are now extraordinarily called in the Name of *GOD*, to inflict ordinary and corporal punishments.

Having said all this, it will be no hard task to make it appear that *Mattathias* was a Person extraordinarily raised up by *GOD*, as were the

Judges.

Judges. And though no mention of that be made, neither by *Josephus*, nor the Book of *Maccabees*, that is not to be stood upon; for we have many of the Judges of *Israel*, of whose call no account is given, and yet undoubtedly they were warranted to act as they did, otherwise they had been Invaders. But if that practice of *Mattathias* conclude any thing by way of Precedent, it will prove that Church-men may invade the Magistrates Office, and kill his Officers, and raise War against him.

Crit. I wonder we hear not *Isotimus* alledging the practice of the ten Tribes, who rejected *Rehoboam*, and made choice of *Jeroboam*, which useth to be very confidently adduced, for proving it to be the peoples right to give Laws to their Princes, and to shake them off when they refuse obedience to their desires. But to this and all other instances of this nature, it is to be answered, that the *Jewish* State being a *Theocracy*, as it is called by their own Writers, their Judges, and many of their Kings had their title from *GOD*'s designation, and the possession was only yielded to them by the People, according to the command, *Deut.* 17. 15. *To set him King over them whom the LORD their GOD did chuse:* So when they sought a King, they came to *Samuel*, as the known Prophet of *GOD*, and desired him to give them a King, which he after-

afterwards did. In like manner was *David* designed to succeed *Saul*, by the same Prophet; and upon *Saul*'s death, the Tribe of *Judah* came and aknowledged, and anointed him King, which was the solemn investiture in that to which he had formerly a right.

Jeroboam being by the same authority designed King over the ten Tribes by the mouth of *Ahijah* in the name of *GOD*, 1 Kings 11. *Ch.* from *v* 28. he derived his Title from that: and there was as good warrants for the people to reject *Rehoboam*, and follow him, as was formerly to quite *Ishboshetb*, and follow *David*.

Another instance of this nature is *Elisha* his sending one to *Jehu*, where that young Prophet saith, 2 *Kings* 9. 6. *Thus saith the LORD GOD of Israel, I have anointed thee King over the people of the LORD, even over Israel*: Upon the notice whereof, *v.* 13. he is declared King. These instances will sufficiently prove what I have alledged, that the Kings of the *Hebrews* having their right from *GOD*, were to be changed when the most High *who ruleth in the Kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will, and setteth up over it the baseſt of men*, interposed his authority and command. One word more, and I have done. When the Law of the Judge is set down, *Deut.* 17. 12. all who do presumptuously, and hearkened not unto the Judge, are

senten-

ſentenced to death, *That evil might be put away from Iſrael, whereby the people might hear, and fear, and do no more preſumptuouſly.* This ſhews that abſolute Submiſſion was due to the Judges, under the pain of death; whereby all private mens judging of their Sentence is ſtruck out. It is true the other Laws that prefer the Commands of GOD to the Laws of men, do neceſſarily ſuppoſe the exception of unlawful Commands: but ſince no Law warrants the reſiſting their Sentence, it will clearly follow that abſolute Submiſſion was due to theſe Judges.

Baſil. Truly theſe things as they ſeem to be well made out from Scripture, ſo they ſtand with Reaſon, ſince no order can be expected among men, unleſs there be an uncontrollable Tribunal on Earth. Our Conſciences are indeed only within GOD'S Juriſdiction: but if there be not a Supreme Power to cognoſce and determine about our Actions, there muſt follow endleſs Confuſions, when any number of People can be got to mutiny againſt Laws: therefore there muſt be a Supreme Court. But the Laws and ſettled Practices of Kingdoms, muſt determine in whoſe Perſon this lies, whether in a ſingle Perſon, the Nobility, or the Major part of the People? Yet I deſire to hear what deciſions the *New Teſtament* offers in this Queſtion.

Crit. Truly that will be ſoon diſpatched; conſider then how our *LORD*, *Matth.* 5. forbids us to *reſiſt evil*; where it is true, he enumerates only ſmall Injuries: ſo I ſhall not deny but that place will amount no farther, than that we ought to bear ſmall Injuries, rather than revenge or oppoſe them; but you muſt yield to the doctrine of Submiſſion, if afterwards you conſider how our *LORD* tells us, *Matth.* 11. 20. *To learn of him, for he was meek*; and that he condemns the thundering fervor of his Diſciples, who called for fire from Heaven, ſhewing the nature of the New Diſpenſation to be quite different from the Old, in that particularly, that *the Son of man came not to deſtroy mens lives, but to ſave them:* And chiefly that when he was to give the greateſt inſtance wherein we ſhould imitate him, he refuſed the defence of the Sword, and commanded S. *Peter to put up his ſword*, *Matth.* 26. 52.

Iſot. If you urge this too much, then muſt I anſwer, that by the ſame Conſequence you may prove we muſt caſt our ſelves on dangers, and not flee from them: ſince we find CHRIST going up to *Jeruſalem*, though he knew what was abiding him there: neither did he fly, which yet himſelf allowed. Beſides, you may as well urge againſt all Prayer to *GOD* for deliverance, his not praying for Angels to aſſiſt him.

But

But the clear account of this is given by himſelf, that the Scriptures were to be fulfilled which fore-told his death. *See pag.* 24. *and Anſwer to the Letter about Jus populi.*

Crit. I muſt confeſs my ſelf amazed at this Anſwer, when I find S. *Peter* ſaying expreſly, 1 *Pet.* 2. 21. *That* CHRIST *ſuffered, leaving us an example that we might follow his ſteps*, and applying this to the very Caſe of ſuffering wrongfully; and that notwithſtanding of that, you ſhould ſtudy to pervert the Scripture ſo groſly beſides: conſider that CHRIST was *to fulfil all righteouſneſs*; if then the Laws of Nature exact our defence in caſe of unjuſt Perſecution for Religion, he was bound to that Law as well as we; *For he came not to deſtroy, but to fulfil the Law*, both by his Example and Precepts. If then you charge the Doctrine of Abſolute Submiſſion, as brutiſh and ſtupid, ſee you do not run into blaſphemy, by charging that Holy One fooliſhly: for whatever he knew of the ſecret Will of GOD, he was to follow his revealed Will in his Actions, whereby he might be a perfect Pattern to all his followers: for GOD'S revealed Will was his Rule, as well as ours. But I dwell too long on things that are clear. As for your Inſtances, they will ſerve you in no ſtead. For his coming to *Jeruſalem* was a duty, all the Males being bound to appear three times a year before

the *Lord* at *Jeruſalem*, at the three Feſtivals, the Paſsover being the firſt of them, *Deut.* 16. And this being a duty, our *LORD* was to perform it, what ever hazard might follow. So we find S. *Paul* on a leſs obligation, going to *Jeruſalem*, notwithſtanding the bonds were fore-told to abide him there. And as for your other pretended Conſequence againſt Prayer, from his not praying for legions of Angels, it bewrays great Inadvertency: for you find our *LORD* a few minutes before, praying in the Garden, *Matth.* 26. 42. over and over again, that *if it were poſſible that cup might paſs from him.* And there is our warrant from his Practice, to pray for a deliverance from Troubles or Perſecutions, if it may ſtand with the holy will of GOD: But for a miraculous deliverance by the miniſtry of Angels, that our *Lord* would not pray for, leſt thereby the Propheſies ſhould not be accompliſhed: and by this, our praying for a miraculous Deliverance, is indeed from his example condemned: but ſtill we are to pray, that if it be poſſible, and according to the Will of GOD, any bitter cup is put in our hands, may paſs from us. Next, let me deſire you to conſider the reaſon given S. *Peter* for putting up his Sword, *Matth.* 26. 52. *For they that take the ſword, ſhall periſh by the ſword.*

Iſot. You miſapply this place palpably, it not being

being designed as a threatning against S. *Peter*, but for the encouragement of his Disciples, and being indeed a Prophesie that the *Jews* who now come against him with Swords and Staves, should perish by the sword of the *Romans*, who should be the avengers of CHRIST'S death. *See page* 25.

Crit. You are beholden to *Grotius* for this Exposition, who is the first of the latter Writers that hath given that sense to these words, tho he voucheth for his opinion some elder Writers; and he designing to prove that a private Person may resist another private Assaillant by force, being a little pinch'd with this place, which seems to condemn simply the use of the Sword, escapes out of it by the answer you have adduced. But though this were the genuine scope of these words, still remember that our *LORD* rejects the use of the Sword for his defence: and if his fore-telling the Destruction of the *Jews*, was of force to bind up S. *Peter*'s hands, why should not also that general promise, *Rev.* 13.10. *He that killeth with the sword, must be killed by the sword*, also secure our Fears, and sheath our Swords, and the rather that it is there subjoined, *Here is the faith and patience of the Saints?* Which seems to imply, that since retaliation will be given out by *God* upon unjust Murderers, therefore Faith and Patience must be the Exercise

of the Saints, which to all unprejudged Minds, will ſound a diſcharge of the uſe of Weapons of War. But after all this, the phraſe of *taking the ſword*, ſeems only applicable to S. *Peter*; for the Band being ſent out by a Magiſtrate, could not properly be ſaid to have taken the Sword, it being put in their hands by theſe who were inveſted with it, though they now tyrannically abuſe their power: but the phraſe agrees much better with S. *Peter*'s drawing it, who had no warrant for it, and ſo did indeed take it. Next, we hear no mention of the Band of Soldiers their uſing their Swords; therefore this Prediction ſeems fitted for S. *Peter*, and all ſuch as miſtaking the nature of the Chriſtian Diſpenſation, do take the Sword. But next, conſider CHRIST'S words to *Pilate*, *John* 18. 36. *My Kingdom is not of this world: if my Kingdom were of this world, then would my ſervants fight, that I ſhould not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my Kingdom not from hence.* And this being ſaid upon the Accuſation the *Jews* had given againſt him to *Pilate*, that he call'd himſelf a King, charging him upon his friendſhip to *Ceſar*, to put him to death, CHRIST'S anſwer ſhews that earthly Kings need apprehend no prejudice from his Kingdom, ſince it not being about worldly things, was not to be fought for.

Iſot. Speak plainly, do you mean by this that

that CHRIST should have no Kingdom upon Earth? which I fear too many of you desire, since you press this so warmly. But consider you not that by this CHRIST only means he was not to set up a Temporal Dominion upon Earth, to justle *Cesar* from his Throne, such as the *Jews* expected from their *Messiah*; and therefore this place is indeed strong against the pretences of some Carnal *Fifth-Monarchy Men*, but is ill adduced to condemn defence, when we are unjustly assaulted by a persecuting Tyrant. *See p.* 25.

Crit. It is no new thing to find the sincere Doctrine of the Gospel misrepresented by Sons of *Belial*; but learn the difference betwixt a Kingdom of the World, and in the World, and so temper your Passion. CHRIST must have a Kingdom in the World, but not of it. And the greatest hazard of a pretending King, being the raising of Wars and Commotions upon his Title, CHRIST'S words are not truly commented on by the practice of his Servants, unless they secure Princes from their Fears of their raising Wars upon his Title: Therefore as the fighting at that time, for preserving CHRIST from the *Jews*, had been contrary to the nature of his Spiritual Kingdom; so the Rule of the Gospel binding all the succeeding Ages of the Church, no less than these to whom it was first delivered,

what was then contrary to the nature of CHRIST'S Kingdom, will be so still. And to this I might add the Doctrine of Peace so much insisted on in the *New Testament*, it being the Legacy CHRIST left to his Disciples, which we are commanded *to follow with all men, as much as is possible, and as in us lies.* And if with all men, sure much more with the Magistrate. And S. *Paul*'s words in the XIII. to the *Romans* are so express, that methinks they should strike a terror in all men from resisting the Superior Powers, lest they *resist the ordinance of GOD, and receive damnation.* And it is observable, that S. *Paul*, who, as a Zealot, had formerly persecuted the Christians, doth now so directly contradict that Doctrine, which was at that time so horridly corrupted among the *Jews*. This place is so express, that it needs not the advantages may be given to it, either from the consideration of the power the *Roman* Empire had usurped over the World, or from the Emperor who then reigned, who must have been either *Claudius* or *Nero*: and if the former, we find, *Acts* 18. 2. that *he banished all the Jews from Rome*, and with them the Christians, not being distinguish'd by the *Romans* from the *Jews*, were also banished: and here was a driving of Christians from *Rome*, which you will not deny to have been a Persecution. But if it was *Nero*,

we

we know very well how the Christians were used by him. But these words of S. *Paul* being as at first addressed to the *Romans*, so also designed by the holy Ghost to be a part of the Rule of all Christians, do prove, that whoever hath the Supreme Power, is to be submitted to, and never resisted.

Ist. If you were not in too great a haste, you would not be so forward, consider therefore the reason S. *Paul* gives for submission to Superior Rulers, is, *because they are the Ministers of GOD for good.* If then they swerve from this, they forsake the end for which they are raised up, and so fall from their power and right to our obedience.

Basil. Truly what you have said makes me not repent of any haste I seemed to make; for what you have alledged proves indeed that the Sovereign is a Minister of *GOD* for good, so that he corrupts his power grossly when he pursues not that design: but in that he is only accountable to *GOD*, whose Minister he is. And this must hold good, except you give us good ground to believe that *GOD* hath given authority to the Subjects to call him to account for his trust; but if that be not made appear, then he must be left to *GOD*, who did impower him, and therefore can only coerce him. As one having his power from a King, is count-

able

able to none for the administration of it, but to the King, or to these on whom the King shall devolve it: so except it be proved, that GOD hath warranted Subjects to call their Sovereigns to account, they being his Ministers, must only be answerable to him. And according to these Principles of yours, the Magistrate's authority shall be so enervated, that he shall no more be able to serve these designs, for which *GOD* hath vested him with Power: every one being thus taught to shake off his Yoak when they think he acts in prejudice of Religion. And here I shall add one thing which all *Casuists* hold a safe Rule in matters that are doubtful, that we ought to follow that side of the doubt which is freest of hazard; here then damnation is at least the seeming hazard of resistance; therefore except upon as clear evidence you prove the danger of absolute submission to be of the same nature that it may ballance the other; then absolute submission, as being the securest, is to be followed. Next, we find Saint *Peter*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 13 *&c.* who being yet infected with the spirit of a *Jewish* zealot, had drawn the Sword; afterwards when indued with power from on High, at length pressing the doctrine of Obedience adding that the pretence of the Christian freedom should not be made a Cloak of maliciousness. And this submission he re-

com-

commends not only to Subjects, whose obedience was more easie, but to Servants who were under a heavier Yoak, according to the Laws of servitude, both among the *Jews* and the *Romans:* and he tells them, That *when they did well, and suffered for it, and took it patiently, that was acceptable.* Withal adding, *For even hereunto were you called; because CHRIST also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that we should follow his steps.* Further, it is to be considered how the *Jews* did upon the first preaching of the Gospel persecute the Christians every where: S. *Stephen* was stoned, and *Saul* got Commissions for making havock of the Church: but because this was done by the authority of the *Sanhedrim,* no resistance was made them, though since at two Sermons we hear of 8000 Converts, we may be induced to believe their number was great. And from hence subsume that the case of persecution being then not only imminent, but also present (besides the grievous persecutions were abiding the Churches for three Centuries) it must be confessed to be strange, that the matter of resistance being at least so dubious, no decision should be given about it in the *New Testament;* nothing being alledged from it that hath any aspect that way. And indeed I cannot conceal my wonder at them who plead so much the authority and fulness of Scripture, to reach even the

the rituals of Worſhip and Government, and yet in ſo great a matter adventure on a practice without its warrant. Truly *Iſotimus*, if theſe things prevail not with you, beyond your little ſmall ſhufflings, I doubt it is becauſe you have loſt the Standard to meaſure Reaſon by, and have given up your Judgment to your paſſions and intereſts.

Iſot. I am far from denying the Doctrine of the Croſs to be a great part of theſe duties we are bound to in the Goſpel; but this muſt not be ſtretched too far, leſt it infer an obligation on us to ſubmit to a forein Prince, the *Turk*, or any other, if he come by force to impoſe on us the *Alcoran*, under a pretence of ſuffering for Religion. *See pag.* 27, and 28.

Baſil. Truly when I hear how much weight is laid on what you have now ſaid, as if it amounted to a demonſtration againſt all hath been hither to adduced; I am in doubt whether to pity their weakneſs, or blame their perverſneſs, who dare adventure on that, the puniſhment whereof the holy Ghoſt hath made damnation, upon ſuch miſtakes: for *God* hath put the Sword in their hands who have the Sovereign Power, which they bear not in vain; for they *are the Miniſters of* God, *and his Revengers, to execute wrath on him that doth evil*: The Magiſtrates then are both by the Laws of *God*, and of all Nations,

Nations, the Protectors of their Subjects, and therefore Tributes and Customs are due to them, for defraying the expence to which that must put them; and Prayers are to be offered up for them, that *we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.* If then a forein Prince invade a Country, under whatever pretence, the Sovereign is bound to defend his Subjects, with the Sword *GOD* hath put in his hand, which comes to be a most lawful War on his side; nay such, as he were a betrayer of his trust, if he omitted it.

Iet. But what if our Prince should consent to such an Invasion, and expose his Subjects to be a prey to such an Invader, must they look on and see themselves destroyed, upon the pretence that GOD hath not put the Sword in their hands, and therefore they must not take it; and because Christ's Kingdom is not of this World, therefore they must not fight for him?

Basil. You suppose a Case not like to fall out in haste; but were it real, that Invader having no Title to that peoples obedience, they may make use of the right of Nature which allows to one out of a Society forcible self-defence, if violently assaulted: and therefore such hostile invasion, be it upon what pretence soever, may be as lawfully resisted, as one private Man may resist another in his own defence, if he threaten to kill him.

him, unless he renounce GOD. If then one Man may resist another, so may more men resist a great force coming against them: for to us who live here, the *Grand Seignior* is but a fellow of our nature, and hath no right over us, no more than one private person hath over his Neighbour. And if you do not acknowledg a great difference betwixt such an asserting of our Liberties, from one that hath no Title to them, and the resisting of a lawful Magistrate, though unjustly persecuting his Subjects, you must be set to your horned book again.

Iset. But at least you will confess that private Men living in a settled Society, have no title to the Sword, according to your Principles; must we then yield out Throats to a Robber that assaults us on the High way? Or to come nearer you, if one threaten to kill us, if we yield not to their Religion, must we give way to their fury?

Basil. Remember still how I told you, that Men living out of Societies have a right to self-defence, and when they come under Societies, they retain all their former rights, such only excepted as are by the laws of the Society judged inconsistent with its order and peace: therefore resisting of the Supreme Powers, or those having their authority, being only discharged, the right of self defence against equals still remains entire.

intire, so that a private person may claim it or not, as he will: and therefore in the case of such an Aggressor, the Laws of Nature and Nations do warrant me to use force when assaulted; yet if a greater consideration appear, and it be evident that my giving way to such unjust force will be more for the honour of the Gospel, if I resist, I do not sin, but do well; but if I resist not, certainly I do better.

End. I have been a witness to this Discourse, not without much pleasure, and do acknowledg my self fully convinced of the necessity of obedience, and submission to the Supreme Power, since without that be once established, as the foundation of Societies, I see not what peace or order can be looked for, but every one will take on him to judg the Law-giver: and if he have so much power or policy as to make a party, he will never want pretences, chiefly about Religion, considering in how many various opinions the Christian world hath divided about it. And it is a poor Answer to say, it must be the true Religion that we should defend, since it is to be supposed every one judgeth the Religion he is of to be the true one: If then according to that Doctrine, Religion be to be defended; certainly though the Religion be wrong, yet every one oppressed in his Conscience, and judging it to be according to truth, is bound to

defend

defend it; since even an erring conscience doth at least tie, if not oblige. For the common resolution of *Casuists* being that a Man under an erroneous Conscience, is yet to follow its dictates, though he sin by so doing: then all parties that are oppressed, ought to vindicate what they judg to be the truth of GOD. And by this you may see to what a fair pass the peace of mankind is brought by these Opinions.

But mistake me not, as if I were here pleading for submission, to patronize the tyranny or cruelty of persecuting Princes, who shall answer to God for that great trust deposited in their hands; which if they transgress, they have a dear account to make to him *who sits in heaven and laughs at the raging and consultings of these Kings or Princes, who design to throw off his Yoak, or burst his bonds in sunder. He who hath set his King upon his holy Hill of Zion, shall rule them with a rod of Iron, and break them in pieces as a Potter's Vessel.* And he to whom vengeance doth belong, will avenge himself of all the injuries they do his truths, or followers: but as they sin against him, so they are only countable to him.

Yet I need not add what hath been often said, that it is not the name of a King, or the ceremonies of a Coronation, that cloaths one with the Sovereign Power; since I know there are, and have been titular Kings, who are indeed but the first

first Persons of the State, and only Administrators of the Laws, the Sovereign Power lying in some Assembly of the Nobility, and States, to whom they are accountable. In which Case, that Court to whom these Kings must give account, is the Supreme Judicatory of the Kingdom, and the King is but a Subject.

Isot. But doth not the Coronation of a King, together with his Oath given, and the consent of the People demanded at it, prove him to have his Power upon the Conditions in that Oath? And these Oaths being mutually given, his Coronation Oath first, and the Oath of Allegiance next, do shew it is a Compact; and in all mutual Agreements, the nature of Compacts is, that the one party breaking, the other is also free. Further, Kings who are tied up, so that they cannot make, nor repeal Laws, nor impose Taxes without the consent of the States of their Kingdom, shew their Power to be limited, and that at least such Assemblies of the States share with them in the Sovereign Power, which is at large made out by *Jus populi.*

Basil. It is certain there cannot be two co-ordinate Powers in a Kingdom; for no man can serve two Masters: therefore such an Assembly of the States must either be Sovereign or subject; for a middle there is not. As for the Coronation of Princes, it is like enough that at

first it was the formal giving their Power to them; and the old Ceremonies yet observ'd in it, prove it hath been at first so among us: But it being a thing clear in our Law, that the King never dies, his Heir coming in his place the very moment he expires, so that he is to be obeyed before his Coronation, as well as after; and that the Coronation is nothing but the solemn inaugurating in the Authority which the King possessed from his Father's death, shews, that any Ceremonies may be used in it, whatever the original of them may have been, do not subject his Title to the Crown to the Peoples consent. And therefore his Coronation Oath is not the condition upon which he gets his Power, since he possess'd that before; nor is it upon that Title that he exacts the Oath of Alegiance, which he likewise exacted before his Coronation. This being the practice of a Kingdom passed all Prescription, proves the Coronation to be no compact betwixt the King and his Subjects: And therefore he is indeed bound by his Coronation Oath to *God*, who will be avenged on him, if he break it, so the matter of it were lawful: but the breaking of it cannot forfeit a prior Right he had to the Peoples Obedience. And as for the limitations Kings have consented to pass on their own Power, that they may act nothing but in such a form of Law, these being

being either the King's free Conceſſions to the People, or reſtraints ariſing from ſome Rebellions, which extorted ſuch Priviledges, will never prove the King a Subject to ſuch a Court, unleſs by the clear Laws and Practices of that Kingdom, it be ſo provided, that if he do malverſe, he may be puniſhed; which when made appear, proves that Court to have the Sovereign Power: and that never weakens my deſign, that Subjects ought not to reſiſt their Sovereign.

Philar. You have dwelt, methinks, too long on this, though conſidering the nature of the thing, it deſerves indeed an exact diſcuſſion: yet this whole Doctrine appears ſo clear to a diſcerning Mind, that I cannot imagine whence all the miſt is raiſed about it can ſpring, except from the corrupt Paſſions or Luſts of men, which are ſubtle enough to invent excuſes, and fair colors, for the blackeſt of Crimes. And the ſmoak of the bottomleſs pit may have its ſhare, in occaſioning the darkneſs is raiſed about that, which by the help of the light of *God*, or of reaſon, ſtands ſo clear and obvious. But when I conſider the inſtances of ſufferings under both Diſpenſations, I cannot ſee how any ſhould eſcape the force of ſo much evident proof as hangs about this opinion. And if it had been the Peoples duty to have reformed by the force of Arms under the Old Diſpenſation, ſo that it

was a baſe and ſervile Compliance with the Tyranny and Idolatry of their Kings, not to have reſiſted their ſubverting of Religion, and ſetting up of Idolatry, where was then the fidelity of the Prophets, who were *to lift up their voices as Trumpets, and to ſhew the houſe of Jacob their iniquities?* And ſince the watch-man who gave not warning to the wicked from his wicked way, was guilty of his Blood, I ſee not what will excuſe the ſilence of the Prophets in this, if it was the Peoples duty to reform: For it is a poor refuge to ſay, becauſe the People were ſo much inclin'd to Idolatry, that therefore it was in vain to exhort them to reform; (*See pag.* 10, 11.) ſince by that Argument you may as well conclude it to have been needleſs to have exhorted their Kings to Reformation, their inclination to Idolatry being ſo ſtrong: but their duty was to be diſcharged, how ſmall ſoever the likelihood was of the Peoples yielding obedience to their warnings. If then it was the Peoples duty to reform, the omiſſion of it was undoubtedly a Sin; how then comes it that they who had it in commiſſion to *cauſe Jeruſalem to know her abominations*, under ſo ſevere a Certificate, do never charge the People for not going about a popular Reformation, nor coercing theſe wicked Kings who enacted ſo much Idolatry, backing it with ſuch Tyranny, nor ever require them

to

to set about it? I know one hath pick'd out some Expressions, (*See Answer to the Letter to the Author of Jus populi*) which to his thoughts sound that way: but truly they are so remote from the sense he stretches them to, that I should wonder much at his Glosses, did I not know that the Bell seems often to ring the hearer's fancy. From these, let us pass to the instances of the first Christians, who endured the sharpest Persecutions with the greatest patience.

Polyb. Here is a large Theme for much discourse, if I should adduce all might be said on this head. Indeed the Persecutions the Christians groaned under for three hundred years, are such, that scarce can they be read without horror; the last especially, which continued for about twenty years under *Diocletian*, and his Colleagues and Successors; and by the number that suffered, we may easily guess what the strength of the Christians was. But this can be doubted by none who have ever looked upon History. *Pliny lib.* 10. *Ep.* 97. writes to *Trajan* (which is reckoned to have been the 104. year of Christ) that in *Pontus* and *Bithynia*, where he was then Proconsul, there were many Christians of all Ages, Ranks and Sexes: and that not only in the Cities, but through the Villages and Country Places: that the Temples were almost desolate, the Sacrifices long intermitted,

and that none almoſt were found to buy the Victims. The number of the Chriſtians being ſo early riſen to that height, we may eaſily imagine to what it ſwelled before *Conſtantine*'s times: not long after that, we find a whole Legion of *Marcus Aurelius* his Army to have been Chriſtians. And if we believe *Tertullian*, their numbers were formidable in his time; for after he had purged the Chriſtians of his times from the deſigns of doing miſchief to their Enemies by ſtealth, he adds, *Apol. cap.* 37. *Should we carry towards you not as ſecret avengers, but as open enemies, would we want the ſtrength of numbers and armies? Are the* Maurs, *the* Marcomans, *or the* Parthians *themſelves, or any Nations ſhut up within their own Country or bounds, more than the whole World? We are ſtrangers to you, and yet we fill all your places, your Towns, your Iſlands, your Caſtles, your Villages, your Councils, your Camps, your Tribes, your Decuries, your Palaces, your Senate, and your Market place: Only we come not to your Temples, but abandon thoſe to you. To what War had we not been both fit and ready, even tho our Forces had been fewer, who are butcher'd ſo willingly, if our Diſcipline did not allow us rather to be killed than to kill?* And he goes on, telling that *ſuch was the number of the Chriſtians, that would they but change their dwellings, and leave the Roman Empire, it would have thereby become an amazing Solitude,*

Solitude, since almost all their Citizens were Christians. And the same writer saith elsewhere, *ad Scap. cap.* 2. That *tho the Romans who were Idolaters, were found guilty of many Conspiracies against their Emperors, yet never were any Christians found guilty of these Practices.* And adds, That *a Christian was no mans enemy, much less the Emperors; but knowing him to be constituted by God, he doth find himself bound to love, reverence, honor, and wish well to him, with the whole Roman Empire, as long as the World lasts.* Therefore, saith he, *We worship the Emperor so as befits him, and is lawful for us, as a man next God, who hath obtained all he hath from GOD, and is inferior to none, but God only.* And a little after, *Cap.* 5. he tells us of the numbers of the Christians, *and how undaunted they were at the Persecution; so that when one* Arrius Antoninus *in* Asia, *was persecuting the Christians, the whole City ran to his Tribunal, declaring themselves Christians.* And he adds, *If the like were to be done at* Carthage, *what would become of all the thousands were there, of every Sex, Age and Rank?* From this we may guess both of the strength and numbers of the Christians of that time, and yet there was not the least inclination among them to resistance. If any doubt the truth of what *Tertullian* saith, as is *p.* 30. he must charge him with very much Impudence, who durst offer such writings to the *Heathens*, in matters of

fact, which could not but be notoriously enough known: Neither do I adduce these places, because I lay so much weight on *Tertullian*'s opinion in this matter, but because he shews us what was the sense of the Christians of his time. A little after him *Cyprian* lived, who also tells us, *ad Demetrianum, That none of the Christians when apprehended, struggled with those who seized on them, nor avenged themselves of that injustice, though their number was great and copious: But their belief of the Vengeance should follow on their Persecutors, made them patient, so that the Innocent yielded to the Guilty.* And we may judge of the number of the Christians of that Age, by what *Cornelius* who was Bishop of *Rome, anno* 254. *in Euseb.* 6. *Book, cap.* 43. tells of the State of the *Roman Clergy* in his time, how there were in it 46 Presbyters, 7 Deacons, 42 Acolyths, 52 Exorcists, Lectors and Porters, and of Widows and poor Persons 1500, and where so many Poor were maintain'd, you must confess the number of the Christians was very great. But if we go to *Diocletian*'s time, we find the number of the Christians incredible; and the Cruelties used against them to have been such, that Hell could devise nothing beyond them. Some were burnt alive, others had boiling Lead poured on them, others had their flesh and joints torn off them by burning Pincers,

others

others were broken to pieces, others ſtretched all out of joint, others hanged up by the Thumbs and cut in ſlices, others hanged up by the heels. And this was univerſal through the whole Empire, and to ſuch a degree, that it continued for many years; and in *Egypt* alone they were often killed by hundreds a day, as *Euſebius* tells, who was a witneſs to much of it. And *Godeau* reckons, that in one month there were ſeventeen thouſand Martyrs killed: and during that perſecution in the Province of *Egypt*, there were an hundred forty and four thouſand, who died by the violence of their Perſecutors, and ſeven hundred thouſand who died through the fatigues of Baniſhment, or of the publick works, to which they were condemned. I had almoſt forgot one ſort of perſecution, which as it was the moſt dreaded, ſo hath in it that which could not but provoke all to the utmoſt of horror and deſpair, which was the proſtituting of their Virgins, more dreaded than any death. But among all theſe vaſt numbers, none offered to reſiſt with the Sword: and yet they were ſo marvellouſly aſſiſted by God, that in their ſufferings they expreſſed the greateſt joy in God, by their Hymns and Pſalms, and the moſt of mildneſs to their Perſecutors. And dare you ſay, *Iſotimus*, that theſe were a ſtupid ſelf-murdering Crew? Or do you think that had they been guilty of ſuch a Crime,

a Crime, as you seem to fasten on the Doctrine of absolute submission; God had appeared for them in such a signal manner, to the conviction and horror of their Persecutors?

I confess there is no piece of Story I read with such pleasure as the accounts are given of these Martyrs; for methinks they leave a fervor upon my mind, which I meet with in no study, that of the Scriptures being only excepted. Say not then they were not able to have stood to their own defence, when it appears how great their numbers were: Or shall I here tell you the known Story of the *Thebean Legion*, which consisted of 6666. who being by *Maximinus Herculeus, an.* 287. pressed in the Oath they gave the Emperor to swear upon the Altars of the Idols, withdrew from the Camp eight miles off; and when he sent to invite them to come and swear as the others had done; they who commanded them answered in all their names, *That they were ready to return and fight stoutly against the Barbarians; but that being Christians, they would never worship the Gods.* Whereupon the Emperor caused tith them, which they received with such joy, that every one desired the lot might fall on himself. And this prevailing nothing on them, he tithed them a second time; and that being also without effect, he caused to murder them all, to which they submitted with-

without resistance. And it is not to be denied, but such a number being driven to such despair, and having so much courage as to dare to die in cold bloud, might have stood to their defence a great while, and at least sold their lives at a dear rate, especially they having got off eight miles from the Army.

Were it my design to back these instances with the great authorities of the most eminent Writers of the Church in these times, I should grow too tedious: but this is so far from being denied, that the only way to escape so strong an assault, is to study to detract from these holy Men by enquiring into any over-reachings, to which their fervor might have engaged them.

Ifot. All their practices are not binding upon us, for many of them did precipitate themselves into hazards, others were against flight, & others against resisting of private assailants, who without warrant came to murder them; therefore the Spirit that acted in them, tho it produced effects highly to the honour of the Gospel, is not to be imitated by us: yet on the other hand, I acknowledg we ought to be slow to judg them. One thing is observable, that *Maximinus* was resisted by the *Armenians*, when he intended to set up Idolatry among them. *Constantine* also invaded *Licinius* when he persecuted the Christians in the *East*: and the *Persians*, when persecuted by

by their King, implored the help of the *Roman* Emperor. Besides, I have seen a Catalogue of many instances of resistance used in some Cities, when their good Bishops were forced away from them, which shews they were not so stupid as you design to represent them. *See pag.*29, &c. and *Jus populi* at length.

Basil. It is certain all Christians have one Law and Rule; and the Laws of Nature are eternal and irreversible: if then the Law of Nature engage us to self-defence, it laid the same ties on them: therefore except you turn *Enthusiast*, you must say, that what is a Duty, or a sin now, was so then likewise; and so you must either charge that *Cloud of Witnesses* with brutish stupidity, otherwise acuse our late forwardness of unjust resistance, since one Rule was given to both; and contradicting practices can never be adjusted to the same Rule. And for these invidious aspersions you would fasten on them, as if they had not understood their own Liberties, they are but poor escapes; for it being already made out that violent resistance even of an equal, is not a Law, but a right of Nature; if they thought it more for the glory of the Gospel to yield even to private injuries, who are we to tax them for it? But for flying from the Persecutors, it is true *Tertullian* condemned it, but that was neither the opinion nor practice of the Christians in these Ages. As

As for what you alledg about the resistance made by the *Armenians* to *Maximinus*, I wish your friend had vouched his Author for what he saith of them; for I am confident he is not so impudent as to prove a matter of fact done twelve Ages ago, by a Writer of this Age. All I can meet with about that, is from *Eusebius*, *lib.*9. *cap.*6. who tells, *That in these times the Tyrant made War against the* Armenians (*men that had been of old Friends and Auxiliaries to the* Romans) *whom because they were Christians, and were pious, and zealously studious about divine matters, that hater of GOD, intending to force to worship the false Gods and Devils, made to become Enemies instead of Friends, and Adversaries instead of Auxiliaries.* And in the beginning of the next Chapter, he tells how in that War he and his Army received a great defeat. Now how you will infer from this, that Subjects may resist their Sovereign for Religion, I see not: for these *Armenians* were his Confederates, and not his Subjects: and it is clear by the account *Eusebius* gives, that *Armenia* was not a Province, nor governed by a Prefect, as were the Provinces. Besides, consider how *Maximinus* came in the fag-end of that great persecution begun by *Diocletian* and *Herculius*, continued by *Galerius*, and consummated by *Maximinus* himself, in which for all the numbers of the Martyrs, and the cruelty of the

the Persecution, there was not so much as a Tumult: which makes it evident the Christians at that time understood not the Doctrine of Resistance. But the *Armenians* case varying from that of Subjects, it was free for them to resist an unjust Invader, who had no Title to their Obedience.

For your Story of *Licinius*, the true account of it will clear mistakes best (*as it is given by Euſ.* 10. *cap.* 5.) *Conſtantine* after he turned Christian, being then Emperor of the *Weſt*, called for *Licinius*, whom *Galerius* had made Emperor in the *Eaſt*, and they both from *Millain* gave out Edicts in favour of the Christians, giving them absolute liberty, and discharging all persecution on that account, which is reckoned to have been in the year 313. afterwards he allied with *Licinius*, and gave him his Sister in marriage, and acknowledged him his Colleague in the Empire. But some years after that Wars arose betwixt them, which *Zoſimus* and *Eutropius* impute to *Conſtantine*'s ambition, and impatience of a Rival: but if we believe the account *Euſebius* gives of it, *Licinius* provoked with envy at *Conſtantine*, and forgetting the Laws of Nature, the bonds of Oaths, alliance and agreement, raised a pestiferous and cruel War against him, and laid many designs and snares for his destruction, which he attempted long by secret and fraudulent ways, but these

these were always by GOD's Providence discovered, and so *Constantine* escaped all his designed mischief: At length *Licinius* finding his secret Arts did not succeed, he openly made War against *Constantine*. And as he was preparing for it, he made War likewise against GOD, and persecuted the Christians, because he apprehended they all prayed for *Constantine*, and wished him success; whereupon he made severe Laws against the Christians, forbidding the Bishops ever to meet among themselves, or to instruct any Women: afterwards he banished all that would not worship the Gods, and from that he went to an open Persecution; and not content with that, he by severe Laws discharged any to visit and relieve such as were in Prison for the Faith. Yet notwithstanding all this, none that were under his part of the Empire did resist him; nay, not so much as turn over to *Constantine* against him, for ought that appears: But upon these things a War followed betwixt *Constantine* and him, wherein *Licinius* was defeated, and forced to submit to what conditions *Constantine* was pleased to give; who took from him *Greece* and *Illyricum*, and only left him *Thrace*, and the *East*. But *Licinius* returning to his old ways, and breaking all agreements, a second war followed, wherein *Licinius* was utterly defeated, and sent to lead a private life at *Thessalonica*, where he was some-

ſometime after that killed, becauſe of new deſigns againſt *Conſtantine.* This being the true account of that Story, I am to divine what advantage it can yield to the cauſe of Subjects reſiſting their Sovereign; for here was a Superior Prince defending himſelf againſt the unjuſt attempts, and hoſtile incurſions of his Enemy, who was alſo inferior to him, as *Euſebius* ſtates it: *whom conſult.* 10. *Book*, 8. *ch. and* 1. *Book of Conſt. life, ch.* 42. *and* 2. *Book, ch.* 2, &c.

And for your inſtance of the *Perſians* imploring the aid of the *Romans*, I am afraid it ſhall ſerve you in as little ſtead: for the account *Socrates* gives of it (*lib.* 7. *cap.* 18.) is, that *Baratanes* King of *Perſia*, did ſeverely perſecute the Chriſtians, whereupon the Chriſtians that dwelt in *Perſia*, were neceſſitated to fly to the *Romans*, and beſeech them not to neglect them who were ſo deſtroyed, they were kindly received by *Aticus* the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, who bent all his care and thoughts for their aid, and made the matter known to *Theodoſius* the ſecond then Emperor: but it happened at that time the *Romans* had a quarrel with the *Perſians*, who had hired a great many *Romans* that wrought in Mines, and ſent them back without paying the agreed hire; which quarrel was much heightned by the *Perſian* Chriſtians complaint; for the King of *Perſia* ſent Ambaſſadours to remand them as fugi-

fugitives: but the *Romans* refuſed to reſtore them, and not only gave them Sanctuary, but reſolved by all their power to defend the Chriſtian Religion, and rather make War with the *Perſians*, than ſee the Chriſtians ſo deſtroyed. Now it will be a pretty ſleight of *Logick*, if from Subjects flying from a Perſecution, and ſeeking ſhelter under another Prince, you will infer that they may reſiſt their own King. And for *Theodoſius* his War, we ſee other grounds aſſigned by the Hiſtorian: and the Politicks even of good Princes in their making of Wars, muſt not be a Rule to our Conſciences: neither know I why this inſtance is adduced, except it be to juſtifie ſome who are ſaid (during the Wars betwixt their own Sovereign and the Country where they lived) to have openly prayed for Victory againſt their Country, and to have correſponded in oppoſition to their native Sovereign.

But I muſt next diſcuſs that Catalogue of Tumults in the fourth and fifth Century, which are brought as Precedents for the reſiſting of Subjects: and here I muſt mind you of the great change was in Chriſtendom after *Conſtantine's* days, before whom none were Chriſtians, but ſuch as were perſuaded of the truth of the Goſpel, and were ready to ſuffer for its profeſſion; ſo that it being then a Doctrine objected to many Perſecutions, few are to be ſuppoſed to have

entred into its discipline without some Convictions about it in their Consciences: but the case varied much after the Emperors became Christian; so that what by the severity of their Laws, what by the authority of their Example, almost all the World rendered themselves Christian; which did let in such a swarm of corrupt men into the Christian Societies, that the face of them was quickly much changed, and both Clergy and Laity became very corrupt, as appears from the complaints of all the Writers of the fourth Century: what wonder then if a tumultuating Humor crept into such a mixed multitude? And indeed most of these instances which are alledged, if they be adduced to prove the corruption of that time, they conclude but too well: But, alas! will they have the authority of Precedents, or can they be look'd upon as the sense of the Church at that time, since they are neither approved by Council or Church-Writer? And truly the Tumults in these times were too frequent upon various occasions; but upon none more than the popular elections of Bishops, of which *Nazianzen* gives divers instances, and for which they were taken from the People by the Council of *Laodicea*, *Can.* 13. It is also well enough known how these Tumults flowed more from the tumultuary temper of the People, than from any Doctrine their Teachers did

did infuse in them. And therefore *Socrates lib.* 7. *cap.* 13. giving account of one of the Tumults of *Alexandria* (made use of by your Friends, as a Precedent) tells how that City was ever inclined to Tumults, which were never compesced without blood. And at that time differences falling in betwixt *Orestes* the Prefect, and *Cyril* the Bishop, who was the first that turned the Priesthood into a temporal Dominion, they had many debates: for *Orestes* hating the power of the Bishops, which he judged detracted from the Prefect's authority, did much oppose *Cyril*; and *Cyril* having raised a Tumult against the *Jews*, wherein some of them were killed, and the rest of them driven out of the City, *Orestes* was so displeased at that, that he refused to be reconciled with him; whereupon 500 Monks came down from *Nitria* to fight for their Bishop, who set on the Prefect, and one of them named *Ammonius*, wounded him in the head with a stone; but the People gathering, they all fled, only *Ammonius* was taken, whom the Prefect tortured till he died; but *Cyril* buried him in the Church, and magnified his Fortitude to the degree of reckoning him a Martyr, of which he was afterwards ashamed. And their being in *Alexandria* at that time a learned and famous Lady, called *Hyppatia*, whom the People suspected of inflaming the Prefect against the Bishop, they

led on by a Reader of the Church, set on her, and dragged her from her Chariot into a Church, and stript her naked, and most cruelly tore her body to pieces, which they burnt to ashes. And this, saith the Historian, *brought no small Infamy, both on* Cyril, *and on the Church of* Alexandria, *since all who profess the Christian Religion, should be strangers to killing, fightings, and such like.* Truly, Sir, he that will found the Doctrine of Resistance on such grounds, hath a mind on very easie terms to run himself upon Condemnation. And yet such like are the warrants your Friends bring from Church History. Therefore I see there is yet good ground to assert that Doctrine was unknown in the Christian Church, till the times wherein the Popes pretended to the Temporal Power over Princes: all whose plea was managed upon the grounds of the great Importance of Religion to be preferred to all human Interests, and that *Christ* had told his Disciples *to buy a sword*; and that Princes being the Ministers of *God*, were to be no longer acknowledged, than they observed that design for which they were set up. Only in one particular, less disorder may be apprehended from the pretensions of the *Roman* Bishops, than from these Maxims that put the power of judging and controuling the Magistrate in the Peoples hands, which opens a door to endless confusions, and

and indeed sets every private Person on the Throne, and introduceth an Anarchy, which will never admit of order or remedy; whereas these who had but one pretender over them, could more easily deal with him, and more vigorously resist him.

Isot. You have said very many things from History, which I shall not at this time undertake to examine: but I am sure it hath been both the Practice and Doctrine of the Reformed Churches, that in case of unjust Tyranny, the States of a Kingdom may put a stop to the fury of a King: and therefore where the Reformation was opposed by Cruelty, it was also defended by Arms. And let me add, that I believe your great quarrel at this Doctrine, is, because the practice of it was so great a mean of preserving the Reformation, which though, in good manners, you must commend, yet I am afraid you hate it in your heart.

Philar. Whether you or we be greater friends to the Reformation, let the world judge by this one Indication, that you study to draw all can be devised for the staining it with blood, which is the constant calumny of its adversaries, whereas we offer with the clearest evidences to evince its Innocence. But let me premise the distinction of Doctrine from Practices; and tho some unjustifiable Practices appear, these must never

be charged on the Reformed Churches, unleſs it be made appear they were founded on their Doctrine. Beſides, the Reformers coming out of the corruptions of Popery, in which the Doctrine and Practice of Reſiſtance upon pretences of Religion were triumphant, it will not be found ſtrange tho ſome of that ill-tempered Zeal continued ſtill to leaven them. But for their Doctrine, I take the Standart of it to be in the Confeſſions of the ſeveral Churches; all which being gathered in one harmony, we are in the right ſcent of their Opinions, when we ſearch for them there. Now the Doctrine of reſiſting of Magiſtrates is by divers of their Confeſſions expreſly condemned, but in none of them aſſerted.

It is true, there were ſome ambiguous expreſſions in our *Scots* Confeſſion, regiſtred in Parliament *Anno* 1567, for *Art.* 14. among the tranſgreſſions of the ſecond Table, they reckon to *diſobey or reſiſt any that God hath placed in authority, while they paſs not over the bounds of their office*; which ſeems to imply the lawfulneſs of Reſiſtance when they ſo tranſgreſs: but beſides that it is not clearly aſſerted, and only inferred, this doth not determine what the *bounds of the Magiſtrate's Office are*: And if it be found that his Office is to coërce with the Sword, ſo as to be accountable to none but to *God*, then no

no Reſiſtance will follow from hence, except of a limited Magiſtrate who is accountable to others. The ſame Explication is to be given to that part of the 24. *Art.* where all ſuch are condemned who *reſiſt the Supream Power, doing that thing which appertaineth to his charge.* But in the ſame Article the Magiſtrate is called *God's Lieutenant, in whoſe Seſſions* God *himſelf doth ſit and judge.* But with this, it is to be conſidered, when that Confeſſion was ratified in Parliament, even when no Sovereign was to look to the clearing of any ambiguities, which might have been upon deſign by ſome, and through the neglect of others, let paſs. The Confeſſions of the other Churches are unexceptionably plain, and without reſtriction in the point of ſubjection: For what ſeems like a Reſtriction in the *French* Confeſſion (*that the yoke of ſubjection is willingly to be born, though the Magiſtrates were Infidels, provided that* God's *Sovereign authority remain entire and uncorrupted*) imports nothing, but that our ſubjection to them, which takes in both Obedience and Suffering, is not to ſtrike out the great Dominion *God* hath over our Souls, whom we ſhould obey rather than man. And even the Confeſſion of the Aſſembly of Divines, ratified by the *Scots General Aſſembly*, ſpeaks of ſubmiſſion to Authority in abſolute terms, without the exception of Reſiſtance

in case of Tyranny, *Cap.* 23. *art.* 4. *It is the duty of People — to be subject to their authority for Conscience sake. Infidelity or difference in Religion, doth not make void the Magistrate's just and legal Aurity, nor free the people from their due obedience to him.* If then the Doctrine of Resistance be to be owned as a Law of Nature, and as a part of the Christian Freedom, how came it that it was not more expressly owned in this Confession, especially since it is known to have been the opinion of most of both these Assemblies? But on the contrary, it seems condemned, and only the undiscerned reserves of *just*, *legal*, and *due*, are slipt in for the defence of their actings. Truly this seems not fair dealing, and such an asserting of Subjection at that time, looks either like the force of truth extorting it, or intimates them afraid, or ashamed to have owned that as their Doctrine to the World. And by this time, I suppose it is clear that the Reformed Churches ought not to be charged with the Doctrine of Resistance.

Poly. Nay, nor the Reformed Writers neither, with whose words I could fill much Paper, and shew how they do all generally condemn the resistance of Subjects: and when any of them gives any Caveat to this, it is not in behalf of the People, but *of the States of the Kingdom, who, they say, perhaps are impowered with authority to curb the tyranny of Kings, as the Ephori among the*

the Lacedemonians, the Tribuns of the people, and the Demarchs in Rome and Athens. Now it is acknowledged, that if by the Laws of the Kingdom it be found that the King is accountable to the States, then their coercing of him is not the resistance of Subjects, but rather the managing of the Supreme Power which lies in their hands. If then you will stand to their decision in this Point, of the Peoples resisting of their Sovereigns, though Tyrants, the debate will not run long, they being so expres. And this will be nothing shaken by any thing you may alledge in some corner of a *Peter Martyr*, or some other Persons of les name; for as from the same Writers, other places may be brought to the contrary; so what can these serve to enervate so much evident proof? Besides, we are not to consider the Writings of some particular Persons, so much as what hath been the generally received opinion among the Protestant Writers, and most taught in their Pulpits and Schools. And whoever will attempt the contradicting that this hath been for absolute submission, it must be confessed to be hard to determin, whether his ignorance be most to be pitied, or his confidence most wondered at. By these things all may guess, if there be not strong grounds to apprehend the Reformed Churches must be innocent of that, which both their Confessions disown,

disown. and their Writers condemn.

Iſot. I confeſs the Author of the *Dialogues* did with great confidence undertake the refuting of what is generally acknowledged about reſiſtance uſed by the Reformed Churches: but his Anſwerer hath ſo refuted all he alledgeth from Hiſtory, that I am confident he repents of his undertaking: and were it to be done again, perhaps he would think on other tasks, than to attempt what hath miſcarried ſo in his hand, that truly I cannot but pity him in my heart.

Eud. It will be ſtrange if he be ſo much miſtaken as your Author repreſents him, yet his deſign in that was ſo good to deliver the Reformation from ſuch a Challenge, that methinks he deſerved a little better uſage than your Friend beſtows on him. But I am much deceived if he be not able to make good all was aſſerted by him: let us therefore hear what *Polybiſtor* ſaith on theſe matters.

Iſot. Begin then with the matter of the *Albigenſes*, where force was uſed againſt *Simon Montfort*, who had not only the permiſſion of the *French* King, as is acknowledged, but was aſſiſted by him by 15000. men, which is vouched by ſome Authors: Beſides, that the cruelties then uſed (which are made uſe of to aggravate their not reſiſting the King of *France*) if pertinently adduced, prove the King of *France* guilty

guilty of acceſſion to them. And the Kings Son, Prince *Lewis*, coming with an Army afterward, ſhews all to have been done by the Kings Command. And what is alledged from the Count of *Tolouſe*, his being a Peer of *France*, by which he was a Vaſſal, and not a Subject, is to no purpoſe; ſince by the Feudal Law, Vaſſals are Subjects; and whatever authority they may have within their own Dominions, they are ſtill Subjects to the Lord of the Feud. *See p.* 418.

Poly. I ſhall not with big words blow away what you alledg; but ſhall examine it from the accounts are given of that War. It is true, the Writers of that time do ſo ſtrangely miſrepreſent theſe Innocents, that little credit is due to moſt of the Hiſtories about them: but thus much is clear, that the *Waldenſes* were every where perſecuted, both in *Dauphine*, *Provence*, *Piedmont*, *Calabria*, *Boheme*, and other places, to which they ſcattered themſelves, and fled for ſhelter: and notwithſtanding all the Perſecutions they lay under, from the Inquiſition in *France*, they never armed againſt the King's authority. Theſe about *Alby* embracing the ſame Doctrine with the *Waldenſes*, and called from the Country they lived in *Albigenſes*, were thundered againſt by the Pope, and a *Jacobin Monk* being killed in their Country, *Pope Innocent* proclaimed a *Croiſade*, promiſing Paradiſe to

to all who came and fought against these Hereticks, and avenged the blood of that Monk: and in particular suspecting *Raymond* Count of *Tolouse*, he Excommunicated him, and absolved his Subjects from their obedience, permitting any to pursue his Person, and possess his Lands; with which he wrote to all Christian Princes to come into his *Croisade*. But the King of *France* was imployed in Wars both with the *Emperor* and King of *England*, and so could not join in it, but gave way to his Barons to take the Cross: And here the King consenting to so cruel an Invasion, did undoubtedly shake much of his right to these Provinces, since he thus exposed them to the fury of an unjust Invader; so that tho they had absolutely rejected his Authority, this had quadrated with the case of a Kings deserting of his Subjects. However the War went on, all managed by the *Legate*, as the Popes war. But *Raymond* came and submitted himself to the Pope, yet the *Legate* went on against *Beziers* and *Carcasson*, who had a great deal of reason to resist such an unjust Aggressor. Afterwards the *Legate* gaping for the County of *Tolouse*, picked another quarrel with *Raymond*, and did excommunicate him of new, tho he had got the Popes absolution: whereupon he armed, with the assistance of the King of *Arragon*, against the *Legate*, and his General *Simon Montfort*: but after-

afterwards the King of *Arragon* was defeated, yet all this while the King of *France* lay neutral, and would not permit his Son to go againſt the *Albigenſes*, becauſe he had promiſed to the King of *Arragon* to be neutral; but the King of *Arragon* being dead, he gave way to it, and ſo his Son came to the Army: and this muſt be that which *Gulielmus Brito* confounds with the beginning of the War. This alſo is that Affair which the *Centuriators* ſay *Philippus Auguſtus* had with the *Albigenſes*. But the *Legate* fearing the numbers Prince *Lewis* brought with him, and apprehending he might have poſſeſſed himſelf of the other places which belonged to the *Albigenſes*, granted them all abſolution, with the protection of the Church; and aſſumed the confidence to tell the Prince, that ſince he had taken the Croſs, he was to depend on his Orders, he repreſenting the Pope, and not to command in that Army as the Kings Son; reproaching him, becauſe his Father had given no aſſiſtance to the deſtruction of the *Albigenſes* when there was need of it: but that after the miraculous Victories had been obtained, he was now come to reap the Harveſt of what was due to them who had hazarded their lives for the Church. And for all this, I refer you to the Hiſtory of the *Albigenſes*, compiled by *M. Perrin lib.* 1. *cap.* 12, &c. But what if by an *overplus*

I ſhould juſtifie the Count of *Toloufe*, tho he had armed againſt the King of *France*, upon the account of his being a Peer of *France*, which exempted him from the condition of ordinary Subjects, of whom *Paſquier Recherches de France, lib.* 2. *cap.* 8 ſaith, It was the vulgar Opinion, that they were conſtituted by *Charles the Great*, who is believed to have given them almoſt as much authority as himſelf had, reſerving only to himſelf the principal voice in the Chapter: but he refutes that vulgar Error, and ſhews how in the end of the *Carolovingian* Race, great confuſions were in *France*, partly through the various Pretenders, but more through their folly: at which time, the Crown of *France* did likewiſe become Elective: and he ſhews how *Eude*, *Robert*, *Raoul*, *Lewis*, ſurnamed *beyond the Sea*, *Lothair*, and another *Lewis*, were choſen Kings of *France*; and the chief Perſons who at that time were moſt active, were theſe Dukes, Counts, and Biſhops, who afterwards were made Peers. *Hugo Capet* therefore taking poſſeſſion of the Crown, for ſecuring himſelf peaceably in it, did confirm thoſe Peers in that great Authority they had aſſumed; which if he had not done, they had given him more trouble. And their conſtitution was, that if any difference aroſe, either betwixt the King, and any of the Peers, or among the Peers themſelves, it ſhould be decided by the Council

Council of the whole twelve Peers. And he proves from an old *Placart*, that they would not admit the *Chancellor*, *Conneſtable*, or any other great Officer of *France* to judg them; they being to be judged by none, but their fellow Peers. Theſe were alſo to be the *Electors* of the King. But *Hugo Capet* apprehending the danger of a free Election, cauſed, for preventing it, Crown his Son in his own time, which was practiſed by four or five ſucceeding Kings. And *Lewis the Groſs* not being crowned in his Fathers time, met with ſome difficulty at his entry to the Crown; which to guard againſt, he crowned his Son in his own time, and ſo that practice continued, till the pretence of electing the King was worn out by preſcription. Yet ſome veſtigies of it do ſtill remain, ſince there muſt be at all Coronations of *France* twelve to repreſent the Peers: and by this time, I think it is well enough made out, that the Count of *Tolouſe* was not an ordinary Subject. And as for your confounding of Subject and Vaſſal, *Bodinus lib. de Rep. cap.* 9. will help you to find out a difference betwixt them, who reckons up many kinds of Vaſſals and Feudataries who are not Subjects: for a Vaſſal is he that holds Lands of a Superior Lord, upon ſuch conditions as are agreed to by the nature of the Feud, and is bound to protect the Superior, but may quit the Feud, by which he is free of that ſub-

ſubjection: ſo that the dependence of Vaſſals on their Lord, muſt be determined by the Contract betwixt them, and not by the ordinary Laws of Subjects. And from this he concludes, that one may be a Subject and no Vaſſal, a Vaſſal and no Subject, and likewiſe both Vaſſal and Subject. The Peers of *France* did indeed give an Oath of homage, by which they became the Liege-men of the King, but were not for that his Subjects: for the Oath the Subjects ſwore, was of a far greater extent. And thus I am deceived if all was aſſerted by the *Conformiſt* in the *Dialogues* on this head, be not made good.

Iſot. But ſince you examine this inſtance ſo accuratly, what ſay you to thoſe of *Piedmont*, who made a League among themſelves againſt their Prince, and did reſiſt his cruel Perſecutions by Armies. *See pag.* 423.

Poly. Truly, I can ſay little on this Subject, having ſeen none of their Writings or Apologies, ſo that I know not on what grounds they went: and I ſee ſo much ignorance and partiality in accounts given from the ſecond hand, that I ſeldom conſider them much.

Iſot. The next inſtance in Hiſtory, is, from the Wars of *Boheme*, where becauſe the Chalice was denied, the People did by violence reſiſt their King, and were headed by *Ziſca*, who gained many Victories in the following War with

with *Sigismund*; and in the same Kingdom fifty years ago, they not only resisted first *Matthias*, and then *Ferdinand* their King, but rejected his authority, and choosed a new King: and the account of this change, was, because he would not make good what *Maximilian* and *Rodolph* did grant about the free exercise of their Religion: and thus when engagements were broken to them, they did not judge themselves bound to that tame submission you plead for. *See p.* 424.

Poly. Remember what was laid down as a ground, that the Laws of a Society must determine who is invested with the Sovereign Power, which doth not always follow the Title of a King: but if he be accountable to any other Court, he is but a Subject, and the Sovereign Power rests in that Court. If then it be made out that the States of *Bohemia* are the Sovereigns, and that the Kings are accountable to them, this instance will not advance the plea of defensive Arms by Subjects. That the Crown of *Bohemia* is elective, was indeed much contraverted; and was at length, and not without great likelihoods, on both sides, of late debated in divers Writings: but among all that were impartial, they prevailed who pleaded its being elective. Yet I acknowledge this alone will not prove it free for the People to resist, unless it be also apparent that the Supreme Power remained with the

States, which as it is almoſt always found to dwell with the People, when the King is elected by them. *Bodin* doth reckon the King of *Bohemia* among theſe that are but Titular Kings: and the Provincial Conſtitutions of that Kingdom do evidently demonſtrate, that the King is only the Adminiſtrator, but not the fountain of their Power: which is made out from many inſtances, by him who writes the *Republick of Bohemia*, who ſhews how theſe Kings are bound to follow the pleaſure and Counſel of their States: and in the year 1135, it was decreed, that the elected Prince of *Bohemia* ſhould bind himſelf by his Coronation Oath to rules there ſet down; which if he broke, the States were to pay him no Tributes, nor to be tied to any further Obedience to him, till he amended. *See Hagecus ad ann.* 1135. And this Oath was taken by all the following Dukes and Kings of *Bohemia*; which is an evident proof that the States had authority over their Kings, and might judge them. To this alſo might be added divers inſtances of their depoſing their Kings, upon which no cenſure ever paſſed. Theſe being then the grounds on which the *Bohemians* walked, it is clear they never juſtified their Reſiſtance, on the account of Subjects fighting for Religion, but on the liberties of a free State, aſſerting their Religion when invaded by a limited Prince.

The

The account of the first *Bohemian* War, is, that *John Huss* and *Jerome of Prague*, being notwithstanding the Emperors Safe-conduct burnt at *Constance*, the whole States of *Bohemia* and *Moravia* met at *Prague*, and found that by the burning of their Doctors, an injury was done to the whole Kingdom, which was thereby marked with the stain of Heresie: and they first expostulated with the Emperor and Counsel about the wrong done them; but no reparation being made, they resolved to seek it by force, and to defend the Religion had been preached by *Huss*; and did declare their design to *Winceslaus* their King (whom the States had before that time made prisoner twice for his maleversation) but at that very time he died in an Apoplexy, some say through grief at that. After his death, *Sigismund* his Brother pretended to the Crown of *Bohemia*: but not being elected, was not their righteous King: so in the following Wars that were betwixt him and *Zisca*, the resistance was not made to the King of *Bohemia*, and therefore all that time was an *Interregnum*, and is so marked by their Historian, who tells, that the *Bohemians* could not be induced to receive him to be their King: he indeed invaded the Kingdom, and crowned himself, but was not chosen by the States till fifteen years after that a Peace was concluded, and he with great difficulty prevailed

upon the States to ratifie his Coronation, and acknowledge him their King. *See Dub. lib.* 24. *& lib.* 26. And by all this, I doubt not but you are convinced that the Wars of *Ziſca* were not of the nature of Subjects reſiſting their Sovereign. And for the late *Bohemian* War, beſides what was already alledged of the Power of the States, their War againſt *Ferdinand*, and the reaſon why by a ſolemn decree they rejected him, was, becauſe he invaded the Crown without an Election, contrary to the fundamental Laws of the Kingdom: hereupon they chooſed the *Prince Elector Palatine* to be their King. It is true, they roſe alſo in Arms while *Matthias* lived, though he did not long ſurvive theſe Tumults: but in all their Apologies they founded their plea on the Liberties of the Kingdom of *Bohemia*. And yet though this ſay much for their defence, I am none of the Patrons of that War, which had very few defenders among the Proteſtants.

Iſot. At length you muſt yield there was War for defence of Religion: but if without the incloſure of *Bohemia* we examine the Hiſtory of *Germany*, there we meet with that famous *Smalcaldick* War, in oppoſition to *Charles* V. who was deſigning the overthrow of the Proteſtant Doctrine, which the *Elector* of *Saxony*, with the *Landgrave* of *Heſſen*, and other free Cities, managed againſt him. *See p.* 427.

Poly.

Poly. If any of the Passions of men have mingled in the actions of Protestants, must these therefore be fasten'd on them as their Doctrine; especially when they went not upon Principles of Religion, but of Provincial Laws? As for *Germany*, let me first tell you how far the Protestants were against Rebellion, upon pretence of Religion. At first the *Rustick War* had almost kindled all *Germany*, which indeed began upon very unjust Causes; but *Sleidan lib.* 5. tells, That *some troublesome Preachers had been the causers of that great and formidable War.* Now it is to little purpose to say they were in many errors, and so fought not for the true Religion; since it was before made out, that if Religion be to be fought for, every man believing his own Religion to be true, is bound to take Arms in its defence, since even an erring Conscience binds: But as these Tumults did spread through *Germany*, *Luther* published a Writing, desiring all to abstain from Sedition, though withal he told he apprehended *some strange Judgment was hanging over the Church-men: but that was to be left to God.* After which he explains the duty of the Magistrates: And adds, That *the People should be severely charged not to stir without the command of their Magistrates, and that nothing was to be attempted by private Persons: that all Sedition was against the command of* God, *and that Sedition was*

nothing but private Revenge, and therefore hated by God. Adding, *That the Seditions then ſtirring, were raiſed by the Devil, who ſtirred up theſe who profeſſed the Goſpel to them, that thereby the truth might be brought under hatred and reproach, as if that could not be of* God *which gave occaſion to ſo great evils.* Then he tells what means were to be uſed for advancing of the Goſpel, *That they were to repent of their ſins, for which* God *had permitted that tyranny of the Church-men.* Next, *That they ſhould pray for the Divine aid, and publickly aſſert the truth of the Goſpel, and diſcover the Impoſtures of the Popes.* And he adds, *That this had been his method, which had been much bleſſed of* God. In a word, the whole ſtrain of that firſt Paper ſhews, that the great bait uſed to train all into that Rebellion, was the pretence of the liberty of Religion, and the tyrannical oppreſſion they were kept under by the Eccleſiaſticks.

But upon this the *Boures* publiſhed a Writing containing their Grievances: The firſt whereof was, *That they might have liberty to chooſe Miniſters, who might preach the Word of* God *purely to them, without the mixture of mens deviſes.* The other particulars related to their Civil Liberties. And upon theſe Pretenſions they appealed to *Luther*, who wrote again, *Acknowledging the great Guilt of theſe Princes who received not the purity of the Goſpel*; but he warns the People

to

to consider what they did, *lest they lost both Body and Soul in what they attempted. That they were neither to consider their own strength, nor the faultiness of their Adversaries, but the justice and lawfulness of the Cause; and to be careful not to believe all Mens preachings; for the Devil had raised up many Seditions and bloody Teachers at that time.* Wherefore he forbids them *to take* God's *Name in vain, and pretend that they desired in all things to follow his Laws:* But minds them *who threatned, that they who took the Sword, should perish by the Sword: and of the Apostle, who commands all to be obedient to Magistrates, charging on them, that though they pretended the Laws of* God, *yet they took the Sword, and resisted the Magistrate.* But he adds, *You say, the Magistrates become intolerable, for they take the Doctrine of the Gospel from us, and oppress us to the highest degree: But be it so, stirs and seditions are not therefore to be raised, neither must every one coërce crimes, that belongs to him to whom the power of the Sword is given, as is express in Scripture. And besides, this is not only according to the Laws, but is by the light of Nature impressed on all mens minds: which shews, that no man can cognosce and judge in his own Cause, since all men are blinded with self-love: And it cannot be denied, but this Tumult and Sedition of yours, is a private Revenge: But if you have any warrant for this from* God, *you must make it out by some signal Miracle. The*

Magistrate indeed doth unjustly, but you much more so, who contemning the Command of God, *invade anothers Jurisdiction.* And he tells them, *That if these things take place, there will be no more Magistracy, nor Courts of Justice, if every man exercise private Revenge. And if this be unlawful in a private Person, much more is it so in a multitude gathered together.* Wherefore he counts them *unworthy of the name of Christians, nay worse than Turks, who thus violate the Laws of Nature.* Then for proof of his opinion, he adduceth *that of our* Lord's, *resist not evil; as also his reproving of S.* Peter *for smiting with the Sword. These steps were to be followed by you,* saith he, *or this glorious Title must be laid down. And if you followed his Example,* God's *power would appear, and he would undoubtedly have regard to you.* And he adds, *How far he had been always from such Practices, and how* God *had blessed his work in his hands: but for you, you advert not how much you obstruct that which you think to promove.* These are a few of *Luther*'s words, by which it will appear both upon what pretences these *Boures* went, and what his sense of them was. But I know it will be said, that as in the first ages of the Church, these good simple men understood not their Liberties nor Privileges, but were wheedled into a sheepish tameness: so likewise when the Reformation was first springing, they did not in that infancy under-

understand the heroick doctrine, that the following ripeness of some Martial Spirits did broach and maintain. Alas! *Luther*, poor Man! he had been bred in his Monastery, and understood not the brave Atchievements of Christian Chivalry.

But who would bear with such disingenuity, as to say, that because he defines Sedition to be private revenge, and afterwards condemns private revenge, therefore he must be understood as only condemning that? *pag.* 432. But as none that reads *Sleydan* dare say that I have alledged one word in *Luther*'s name, but what is faithfully translated out of these Writings: so the parcels I have here inserted, will clearly discover that Rebellion to have been coloured over with the pretence of Oppression, Persecution, and hindering the Doctrine of the Gospel: and *Luther*'s opinion in that must not be looked upon, as only his private sense, but that which was undoubtedly received by the rest of the Protestants in *Germany*, as appears by the series of the Story. And whatever passion *Luther* might have expressed, that will no more brangle what I say, than any of his other unjustifiable fervors will shake the rest of his Doctrine. For I do not adduce him here only as a private Doctor speaking his single thoughts, but as the Head of the Protestants, delivering a Doctrine which

which was then received among them.

Ifot. But he afterwards changed his Opinion when the League of *Smalcald* was entred into, and then we find the Proteſtants in another tune; for upon apprehenſions of miſchief deſigned againſt them, they entred into a defenſive League among themſelves: tho the Conſtitution of the Empire being feudal, the Emperor was their Sovereign: yet both Princes and free Cities entred into this League, which afterwards broke out into War. *See p* 433.

Poly. Before I examine that Affair, I muſt firſt clear the way by removing a miſtake, which truly I judged none capable of that had ever read any thing of the Conſtitution of the *German Empire*, or of the Power of the *Electors*, *Princes*, and *free Cities*. I muſt therefore ſince I have to do with ſo much ignorance or perverſneſs, ſhew that the Emperor is not Sovereign in *Germany*; though the thing is ſo plain, that I am almoſt aſhamed to go about it. The *German Empire* was hereditary from the days of *Charles the Great* till *Henry the Fowler*, and then it begun to be Elective: and as is uſual in all ſuch caſes, they who had the right of Election, got by degrees the authority transferred upon themſelves: but the particular time when this begun, is not ſo clearly defined by the *German* Writers. It is true, the *Diet* of *Germany* is not like the League of the

the *United Provinces*, or of the *Cantons* of *Switzerland*, where the Authority remains with the ſeveral States and *Cantons*, and they only meet for Counſel: but the *Diet* hath the ſupreme Authority, both of depoſing of Emperors, as was practiſed in the caſe of *Adolphus* and *Wenceſlaus*, and of fining, baniſhing, and forfeiting, either Princes or Cities. And the Princes declare after the Emperor is Crowned, that they are the Vaſſals of the Empire, and not of the Emperor. And when the *Diet* ſits not, all things are judged by the *Imperial Chamber*, whoſe Preſident muſt be a Prince of the Empire, who hath ſix Aſſeſſors from the Emperor, ſeven from the ſeven *Electors*, twenty from the ten Circles, two from each of them; and by them all the differences among the Princes or Members of the Empire are decided. Upon greater occaſions, the *Diet* is called, which *Thuan* compares to the Aſſembly of the *Amphictyons* in *Greece*, that was made up of Princes, who had no dependence one upon another. The *Diet* is not called by the Emperor, but by the Decree of a former *Diet*: or if the Emperor call one, the Princes are not bound to come to it. And ſo the Princes refuſed to come *Anno* 1554. and *An.* 1506. By the *Diet* Laws are given to the Emperour, as well as to the other Princes: and any Mony is raiſed for the uſe of the Empire, is not put in

the

the Emperors hands, but in the bank of ſome Town, as ſhall be agreed on. *Bodin* tells he ſaw Letters from a *German* Prince to *Monmorancy*, telling him, that the King of *France* had reaſon to complain of *Charles* the Fifth, and of his Brother, to the Duke of *Saxony*, and the Count *Palatine*, who were the Vicars of the Empire, becauſe they had, contrary to the Laws of the Empire, and former Cuſtoms, ſuppreſſed the Kings Letters to the States of the Empire. And *Maximilian* the firſt in a *Diet* at *Conſtance*, *Anno* 1507. acknowledged, that the Majeſty of the *German* Empire conſiſted in the Princes, and not in the Emperor himſelf. I might here add much from the way of the Emperors treating with the Princes, by ſending and receiving of Ambaſſadors that go betwixt them, by the ſtate in which he receives Viſits from them, and returns them to them, by the Princes treating and being treated with, by all forein Princes, who write to them *Brother*, and not *Couſin*, by their making of Peace and War among themſelves: and ſhould indeed run out into a long digreſſion, if I adduced all might be alledged for proving the Princes of the Empire to be none of the Emperors Subjects: but I have no mind to engage in a vain ſhew of reading upon ſo plain a Subject. One thing I ſhall only add, that by the 12. Chapter of the *Bulla Aurea*, it is expreſly provided, that

that the Electors ſhall meet together yearly in the four weeks that follow *Eaſter*, for conſulting about the Affairs of the Empire: and this is thus explained in the 4th Article of the *Ceſarean Capitulation*, *That it ſhall be free for the ſix Electors by the vigor of the Bulla Aurea, to meet together as often as they pleaſe, for conſulting about the Commonwealth, and that the Emperour ſhall make no hinderance to it, nor take it in ill part.* And hence it is that theſe who give account of the ſtate of the Empire, laugh at their ignorance, who through a childiſh miſtake aſcribe the Sovereign Power to the Emperor. The ſame may be added of the free Cities united together by a League at leaſt 500 years old, called the *Hanſe-towns*, who came under the protection of the Maſter of the *Teutonick Order*, that poſſeſſed *Pruſſe*: and *an.* 1206. they were ſo free, that they ſent a Navy to *Henry* III. of *England*, and got great priviledges from him for their traffick in *England*. There were then 72. Cities in the League, who renewed their League every tenth year, and conſulted whom to receive, or whom to exclude from their friendſhip, and choſe a Protector to themſelves. And one of the Conditions on which any City might be of this League, was, that they were free Towns: and therefore it was that ſome Towns in the *Netherlands* being of this League,

their

their Princes were by Oath to confirm their freedom, otherwiſe they could not be comprehended within that League; the end whereof was to defend one another in any neceſſity they might fall in. Let theſe things then declare whether *Germany* be a Monarchy or not, and it will never prove the Emperor to be the Sovereign, becauſe the Empire is feudal, and the Emperor gives the Inveſtitures to the Princes; for they are not the Feudatories of the Emperor, but of the Empire: and the Emperor by giving the Inveſtiture becomes not their Lord: for in the Interregn of the Empire, the *Electors* of *Palatine* and *Saxe* are the Vicars of the Empire, and give the Inveſtitures, who are not clothed with any authority over the reſt, but only as they are the Vicars of the Empire, and not of the Emperor. And moſt of the Princes of *Italy* receive ſtill their Inveſtiture from the Emperor, but are far from concluding themſelves his Subjects upon that account. And who thinks the King of *Naples* the Popes Subject, tho he receive his Inveſtiture in that Crown from him? Theſe things being thus cleared, it will be evident that the Wars betwixt *Charles* V. and the Duke of *Saxony*, will never be a Precedent for Subjects reſiſting their Sovereign. And having ſaid ſo much, it will be to no purpoſe to examine the riſe and progreſs of the *Smalcaldic* League,

League and War, only thus much is clear, that the leaguing of the Princes and Cities together among themſelves, or with other Princes, was not held contrary to the Laws of the Empire: for after the *Smalcaldic* League, both the Emperor and other Kings, as *France* and *England*, treated with them, and ſent Embaſſadors to them: Yea, the Pope ſent a *Nuncio* to the *Elector* of *Saxe*, and *Landgrave* of *Heſſen* at *Smalcald*, and yet never were they accuſed by the Emperor for entring into that League of mutual defence: which ſhews it was not judged contrary to the duty of theſe Princes to aſſociate among themſelves, or with others. And the City of *Strasburg*, and after them the *Landgrave* of *Heſſen*, made a League with the *Switzer Cantons* that received the Reformation, for mutual defence againſt any Invaſion upon the account of Religion. At *Ausburg* the Emperor did on the 11. of *November* 1530. declare, that ſince the Proteſtants did reject the Decree made about Religion, he had entred in an agreement with the reſt of the *Diet*, not to offend any, but to defend themſelves, if any force were uſed againſt theſe who owned that Religion. And in the following *December* the Proteſtant Princes met at *Smalcald*, and made an agreement among themſelves in the ſame ſtrain: neither were they ever condemned for ſo doing, but continued in a good cor-

correſpondence with the Emperor many years after that, till being invaded by the Duke of *Brunſwick* the War took its riſe, which is all along proved to have been according to the Laws and Liberties of the Empire. And thus this Caſe doth vary exceedingly from the matter of our Debates.

Eud. If I may glean after your Harveſt, I could add, that the Divines of *Germany* were notwithſtanding of all the immunity of the Princes, and injuries they met with, very much againſt all warlike preparations. Many veſtigies of this appear through *Melancton*'s Letters, particularly in his 71. Letter to *Camerarius an.* 1528. where he gives account of the inclinations many had to War, and with how much diligence he had ſtudied to divert them from it, though great injuries had been done them; and that it was believed that many of the Princes had ſigned a conſpiracy againſt them. And *Scultet Exer. Evang. lib.* 2. *cap.* 5. tells how *Grumbachius* and *Juſtus Jonas* animated the Elector of *Saxe* to the War, aſſuring him of the Empire of *Germany*, if he would adventure for it: which, he adds, the Elector did: and his ſo doing, he compares to his throwing himſelf over the Pinacle of the Temple; but all quickly repented them of the attempt, the Elector being defeated, taken, and kept Priſoner many years,

years, and his ill Counſellors were well ſerved for their advice, *Grumbachius* was quartered, and *Jonas* was beheaded. Thus you ſee how that war is cenſured by one of the beſt of the late *German* Divines. By this time, I think no ſcruples can dwell with any about the *German* War, and that it agrees with the caſe of a Prince defending his Religion and Subjects, againſt the unjuſt invaſion of another Prince, to whom he owes neither obedience nor ſubjection: and this will eaſily ſatisfie all that know either Law or Hiſtory, whether the Author of the *Dialogues* deſerved to be treated as his *Anſwerer* doth: But it is no new thing to find ignorants full of confidence, and cowards full of boaſtings.

Iſet. But for *Sweden*, you yield it, and acknowledge, that becauſe their King came againſt them in an unjuſt invaſion, deſigning to ſubvert their Religion, they not only armed againſt him, and reſiſted him, but depoſed him, and put his Uncle in his place, than which nothing can be more expreſs. *See p.* 441.

Poly. The deſign of the *Conformiſt* was to prove that the firſt Reformers did not teach the doctrine of Subjects their reſiſtance upon the account of Religion; but he meant not to make good all that followed after that: therefore left the more conſiderat when they heard of the States of *Sweden* their depoſing of *Sigiſmund*,

might have mistaken that, as he knows some have done, and confounded it with the Reformation, he gave the true account of that Affair as it was: and it being seventy years after the Reformation was first brought thither, cannot be fastened on the Reformation. Besides the whole Tract of the *Swedish* History proves, that the Estates, as they elected, so also coerced, and frequently deposed their Kings: and therefore *Bodin* reckons *Sweden* among these divided States, where the Supreme Power lay betwixt the King and the Nobility: and tells how in his own time *Henry* King of *Sweden* having killed with his own hand, one that presented a petition to him, the States forced him to quit the Kingdom to his Brother: and that he had been for seventeen years a prisoner when he wrote his Books *de Republica*: It being thus frequent in *Sweden* upon malversation, not only to resist, but to depose their Kings, it was no wonder if when *Sigismund* came against them with an army of *Polanders*, whose Sovereign he was not, (for none are so ignorant to think the King of *Poland* is a Sovereign) they resisted him: since that was a subjecting of *Sweden* to foreign force, and so did totally overturn the whole Foundation of the Kingdom. But after all this, I may add, that *Charles* Duke of *Suderman*, was not too well reported of, for that abrogation of his Nephew

Nephew, it being generally imputed to his ambition. And thus you see upon how many Accounts that Action of the *Swedish* State will not serve your turn.

Isot. But these of *Zurich* resisted the other five Cantons, and being provoked by their injuries, they stop'd the Passages of Victuals to them, upon which a War followed. As also at *Basel*, the people did maintain and assert the Reformation by Arms against their Superiors, and brake the Images, and burnt them: they also made the Senate turn off some of their number who favored the Mass. *See p.* 443, 444.

Poly. As for the War among the *Cantons*, it is undeniable that it was not of Subjects against their Sovereigns, since the Cities of *Helvetia* have no dependence one upon another; nor can any one City be tied to the opinion or decree of the rest, without their own consent: which shews that every *Canton* is a free State within it self, and therefore their warrings among themselves, makes nothing for subjects resisting of their Sovereigns. And what is alledged from the tumult of *Basel*, is as little to our purpose: for these free Cities being Democratical, it was no wonder if the people offended with the Senate, did raise that Commotion: and the Historian expressly asserts, that what they did, they openly declared, was not for defence of Religion,

but for vindicating of their own liberty. And in the end of the Story it appears what they designed, for they made the Senat receive 260. out of the Companies of the Citizens, whose counsel should be carried along in the greater concernments, that might be either for GOD's Glory, or the Good of the Commonwealth. But if you lay claim to this Story as a Precedent, you must acknowledge that a Reformation may be not only maintained by force, but that Magistrats may be removed from their Office, if they go not along with it; and that the people may in their own Authority, without waiting for the Magistrats concurrence, go by violence and break down Images, and throw out an established Religion. But this belongs not to the case of Subjects, since in these free Cities the power is certainly with the people, and so they are not Subjects to the Senat. And for *Geneve*, it is so fully proved, that it was a free Imperial City, that I need add nothing to make it out. One instance will abundantly suffice to prevail upon the belief of any who can doubt whether the Bishop of *Geneve* was their Prince, which is, that the Bishops of *Geneve* did frequently become Burgesses in it: In particular, *Peter de Baulm*, the last who sate there, was received a Citizen by the Senat of *Geneve* 15. *July* 1527. which doth fully prove that he could not be their

their Lord. But as for the Reformation of *Geneve*, it is true *Sleydan* hints as if the Bishop and Clergy had left the City, being angry at the Reformation: but in that he was mistaken, for their Bishop left the City *an.* 1528. and made war against it upon some disputes were betwixt him and them about their privileges: for though he was not Lord of the City, yet the Countrey about it belonged to him. But *an.* 1533. he returned to the City, and left it in the *July* of the same year, fearing some seditious Tumults, which he had the more reason to apprehend, because of his Transactions with the Duke of *Savoy*, whereby he made over to him his interest in the City. And it was two years after this before the Reformation was received by that City. For after he left them, they passed a Decree for preserving the old Religion, and discharging of the *Lutheran*, and banished two of the Ministers of that Religion. And on the first of *January* 1534. after the Bishop was gone, his Vicar published an Edict, discharging all Assemblies for Divine Worship, without the Bishops permission; and all Bibles in the *French* or *German* Tongues, were condemned to be burnt. And for the Duke of *Savoy* his invading them, and being resisted by them, it makes nothing for your design, this being a free Imperial City, resisting an unjust Invader. For all this, see *Geneva restituta*.

Isot. But at least the States of the United Provinces did maintain their Religion by Arms, when *Philip* the Second was introducing the Inquisition among them: and tho these Wars were upon mixed grounds, so that Papists as well as Protestants concurred in them, yet it is undeniable that Religion gave the chief rise to them, and was the main consideration that engaged the Protestants into that War. See *pag.* 446.

Poly. One error runs through all your smatterings, which is, that you never distinguish betwixt a State governed by a Monarch, where subjection is due to him by the constitution of the State, and a limited Prince, who by the Laws of that Society is accountable to, and censurable by the Nobility and people; which states so great a difference, that he must be very purblind who doth not observe it; And therefore I will first shew you, that the Prince of the *Netherlands* was but a precarious Prince, governing a free people at their pleasure and precariously, as *Heuterus* and *Grotius de Ant. Reip. Batav.* call him: And among the Laws of the Government of *Batavia*, one was, that the old Customs and Laws should be sacred; and that if the Prince decreed ought against them, he was not to be obeyed: and so it was usual among them upon a transgression, to depose their Princes, of which many

many instances are reckoned by *Grotius*, and therefore he compares their Princes to the *Lacedemonian* Kings, upon whom the *Ephori* and the Senat might have cognosced. The *Brabantins* had indeed looked better to their liberty than the rest, and so had guarded against the deceit of their Princes (who might have broken their Laws upon the pretence of a publick good) by an expres agreement, that if their Prince should violate the Laws, they should not be tied to obedience nor fidelity to him, till their injuries were removed: and this was confirmed by the examples of their Ancestors, *Gr. An. lib.* 2. And a little after, he adds, That the other Provinces in *Belgium*, had by practice that same privilege, and that the rather, that being all united to *Brabant*, by *Maximilian*, they were to enjoy the same privileges with them. The *Brabantins* had also a privilege of chusing a Conservator in any great hazard, called *Ruart*, *Strada tom.* 1. *lib.* 9. whose power was equal to the *Roman* Dictators: this they had by the privileges of the *Lætus introitus*. And upon this they chused the Prince of *Orange* their *Ruart*, *anno* 1577. And to run no further for proofs of this, when *Philip* was inaugurated their Prince, he expresly provided, that if he broke their privileges, they should be free from obedience and fidelity to him: and this was the

ground on which they depoſed him, as appears by their Decree, *St. tom.* 2. *lib.* 4. By theſe indications it is apparent, that the Prince of the *Netherlands* was not Sovereign of theſe Provinces, ſince they could cogniſce upon him, and ſhake off his authority. But I ſhall next make out, that *Religion* was not the ground upon which theſe Wars were raiſed: The Reformation came unto the Provinces in *Charles* the V. his time, who cruelly perſecuted all who received it, ſo that theſe who were butchered in his time, are reckoned not to be under 100000. *Gr. Annal. lib.* 1. All this Cruelty did neither provoke them to Arms, nor quench the Spirit of Reformation; whereupon *Philip* deſigned to introduce the Inquiſition among them, as an aſſured mean of extinguiſhing that Light. But that Court was every where ſo odious, and proceeded ſo illegally, that many of the Nobility, among whom divers were Papiſts, entered in a Confederacy againſt it, promiſing to defend one another, if endangered: Upon this, there were firſt petitions, and after that tumults; but it went no further till the Duke of *Alva* came, and proceeded at the rate of the higheſt Tyranny imaginable, both againſt their Lives and Fortunes, particularly againſt the Counts of *Egmont* and *Horn*, ſuſpect of favoring the former diſorders. But (it being needleſs to make a vain

ſhew of reading in a thing which every boy may know) after the Duke of *Alva* had ſo tranſgreſſed all Limits, the Nobility and Deputies of the Towns of *Holland*, who were the Depoſitaries of the Laws and Privileges of that State, met at *Dort*, *anno* 1572. *Gr. de Ant. Bat. cap.* 6. and on *July* 19, decreed a War againſt the Duke of *Alva*, and made the Prince of *Orange* their Captain, which was done upon his exacting the twentieth penny of their Rents, and the tenth of their moveables, in all their tranſactions and merchandiſes. Yet all this while the power was in the hands of Papiſts, *Gr. Annal. lib.* 3. Nor was the Proteſtant Religion permitted till the year 1578. that in *Amſterdam*, *Utrecht* and *Harlem*, the Magiſtrats who were addicted to the *Roman* Religion, were turned out, which gave great offence to ſome of their Confederates who adhered to Popery. And upon this the Proteſtants petitioned the Arch-Duke *Matthias*, whom the States had choſen for their Prince, that ſince it was known that they were the chief object of the *Spaniſh* hatred, and ſo might look for the hardeſt meaſure, if they prevailed: it was therefore juſt they who were in the chief danger, might now enjoy ſome ſhare of the Liberty with the reſt; wherefore they deſired they might have Churches allowed them, and might not be barred from publick truſt,

truſt, which after ſome debate was granted. And let this declare whether the War was managed upon the grounds of Religion. or not. The year after this, the States of *Holland*, *Geldres*, *Zeland*, *Utrecht*, and *Frieſland*, met at *Utrecht*, and entred in that Union which continues to this day: by which it was provided, that the Reformed Religion ſhould be received in *Holland* and *Zeland*, but the reſt were at liberty, either to chuſe it or another, or both, as they pleaſed. So we ſee they did not confederate againſt *Spain* upon the account of Religion, it not being the ground of their League; but in oppoſition to the *Spaniſh* Tyranny and Pride. And in their Letters to the Emperor, *Jan.* 8, 1578. *Str. tom.* 2. *lib.* 2. they declared, that they never were, nor ever ſhould be of another mind, but that the Catholick Religion ſhould be ſtill obſerved in *Holland:* and in the end of the year 1581. they decreed, that *Philip* had forfeited his Title to the Principality of *Belgium*, by his violating their Privileges, which he had ſworn to obſerve: whereupon they were (according to their compact with him at his inauguration) free from their obedience to him; and therefore they choſe the Duke of *Alenſon* to be their Prince. And now review all this, and ſee if you can ſtand to your former aſſertion, or believe theſe Wars to have proceeded upon

upon the grounds of subjects resisting their Sovereign, when he persecutes them upon the account of Religion, and you will be made to acknowledge, that the States of *Holland* were not subjects, and that their quarrel was not Religion.

Isot. All this will perhaps be answered in due time: but from this let me lead you to *France*, where we find a long Tract of Civil Wars upon the account of Religion, and here you cannot pretend the King is a limited Sovereign; neither was this War managed by the whole States of *France*, but by the Princes of the Blood, with the Nobility of some of the Provinces; and these began under *Francis* the Second, then about sixteen years of Age, so that he was not under Non-age: and tho they were prosecuted under the Minority of *Charles* the Ninth, yet the King of *Navarre*, who was Regent, and so bore the King's Authority, was resisted: and after *Charles* was of age, the Wars continued, both during his Reign, and much of his Brother's, and did again break out in the last King's Reign. The Protestants were also owned and assisted in these Wars, not only by the Princes of *Germany*, but by the three last Princes who reigned in *Britain*. So here we have an undeniable instance of Subjects defending Religion by Arms. See *pag.* 454.

Poly.

Poly. I must again put my self and the company to a new penance by this ill understood piece of History, which you have alledged: and tell you how upon *Henry* the Second's death, *Francis* his Son, was under age by the *French* Law, (for which see *Thuan. lib.* 16.) which appointed the Regents power to continue till the King was 22 years of age at least, as had been done in the case of *Charles* the 6. which yet the History of that time saith, was a rare privilege, granted him because of his Gracefulness, and the love was generally born him, whereas the year wherein the Kings were judged capable of the Government was 25. But *Francis*, tho under age, being every way a Child, did set away both the Princes of the Blood, the Constable and the Admiral from the Government, which he committed to his Mother, the Cardinal of *Lorrain* and the Duke of *Guise*. Upon this the Princes of the Blood met, and sent the King of *Navarre* who was the first Prince of the Blood, to the King, to complain of their ill usage: but tho he was much neglected at Court, yet his simplicity was such, that he was easily whedled out of his pretensions. Upon this the Prince of *Conde* having a greater spirit, and being poor, thought upon other Courses, and as it is related by *Davila, lib.* 1. gathered a meeting at *Ferté*, where he propoſed the injury done

done the Princes of the Blood, who in the minority of their King were now excluded the Government: which, contrary to the *Salick* law, was put in a womans hand, and trusted to Strangers: wherefore he moved that (according to the practices of other Princes of the Blood, in the like Cases, which he adduced) they might by arms make good their right, and assume the Government in the Kings minority. But the Admiral considering well the hardiness of the enterprise, said, that another way must be taken to make it succeed, which was, that since *France* was full of the followers of *Calvin*, who through the persecutions they had lain under, were now almost desperat, and had a particular hatred at the Brethren of *Lorrain* as their chief enemies, therefore it was fit to cherish them, and make a party of them, by which means assistance might be likewise hoped for from the Princes of *Germany*, and the Queen of *England*: and to this advice all present did yield. Upon this, saith *Thuan, lib.* 16. many Writings were published, proving the Government of the Kingdom in the King's minority to belong to the Princes of the Blood, and that by the Laws of *France*, the Regents power was not absolute, but to be regulated by the Assembly of the States, wherein many instances of the *French* Law were adduced: and whereas it was alledged that the King was major at 15.

which

which was proved from an Edict of *Charles* the Fifth, this was fully refuted; and it was shewed that notwithstanding of the Edict of *Charles* the Fifth, his Son was not admitted to the Government till he was full 22 years of age, and that in his minority the Kingdom was governed by a Council of the Princes and Nobility, which was established by an Assembly of the States. I shall not meddle further in the debate which was on both hands about the year of the King's majority, or the Power of the Princes of the Blood in his minority, but shall refer the Reader to the sixth Book of the voluminous History of *France*, for that time, whose Author hath suppressed his Name, where a full abstract of all the writings that passed on both sides about these matters is set down: but this shews how little your Friends understand the History of that time, who take it for granted that *Francis* the Second was then Major, since it was the great matter in controversie. But to proceed in my Accounts.

These grounds being laid down for a war, the Prince of *Condé*, as *Thuan* relates, would not openly own an accession to any design, till it should be in a good forwardness, but trusted the management of it to one *Renaudy*, who tho a Catholick by his Religion, yet drew a great meeting of Protestants to *Nantes*, in the beginning of *February*, *anno* 1560. where he stirred them

them up to arm: and in his Speech, after he had repreſented all the grievances, he added, that the greateſt ſcruples that ſtuck with many, was the King's Authority, againſt which whoſo roſe he did rebel: and he anſwered, acknowledging the obedience due to Kings, notwithſtanding their wicked Laws; and that it was without doubt, that all who reſiſted the Power conſtituted by GOD, reſiſted his Ordinance: but added, their reſiſtance was of theſe Traitors, who having poſſeſſed themſelves of the young King, deſigned the ruin both of King and Kingdom. This then will clear whether they walked on the Principles of Subjects reſiſting when perſecuted by their Sovereign, or not.

Upon this they deſigned to have ſeiſed on the King, but as it was to be executed, though it had been long carried with a marvellous ſecrecy, it was at length diſcovered, and the King conveyed to *Amboiſe*: and as the Proteſtants were gathering to a Head, the King's Forces came upon them, and defeated and ſcattered them. But a little after this the King died, in good time for the Prince of *Condé*; for his acceſſion to theſe Commotions being diſcovered, he was ſeiſed on and ſentenced to death; but the King's death as it delivered him, did alſo put an end to the queſtions about the King's majority, his Brother *Charles* the Ninth, being a child,

child, so that the Regency was undoubtedly the King of *Navarre* his right; yet not so entirely but that the other Princes were to share with him, and the Assembly of the States to direct him, as the Lawyers proved from the *French* Law. The consultation about the Protestants took them long up, and a severe Edict passed against them in *July* 1561. But in the *January* of the next year a solemn meeting was called of all the Princes of the Blood, the Privy Counsellors and the eighth Parliament of *France*, in which the Edict of *January* was passed; giving the Protestants the free exercise of their Religion, and all the Magistrats of *France* were commanded to punish any who interrupted or hindered this liberty, which Edict you may see at length, *Hist. d' Aubig. lib.* 2. *c.* 32. But after this, as *Davila, lib.* 3. relates how the Duke of *Guise* coming to *Paris* did disturb a meeting of the Protestants, so that it went to the throwing of Stones, with one of which the Duke was hurt, upon which he designed the breach of that Edict, and so was the Author and Contriver of the following Wars. After this the Edict was every where violated, and the King of *Navarre* united with the Constable, and the Duke of *Guise* for the ruin of the Protestants: upon which the Prince of *Conde*, as the next Prince of the Blood, asserted the Edicts, so that the Law was on his side: neither

ther was the Regents power absolute or Sovereign: and the Prince of *Condé* in his *Manifesto* declared, he had armed to free the King from that captivity these stranger Princes kept him in, and that his design was only to assert the authority of the late Edict, which others were violating. Upon this the Wars began, and ere the year was ended, the King of *Navarre* was killed: after which the Regency did undoubtedly belong to the Prince of *Condé*. And thus you see upon what grounds these Wars began: and if they were after that continued during the majority of that same King, and his Successors, their Case in that was more to be pitied, than imitated: for it is known that Wars once beginning, and Jealousies growing strong, and deeply rooted, they are not easily setled.

And to this I shall add what a late Writer of that Church *Sieur d'Ormegrigny* hath said for them, in his reflections on the Third *Chapter of the Polsticks of France:* wherein he justifies the Protestants of *France* from these Imputations. What was done that way, he doth not justifie, but chargeth it on *the despair of a lesser Party among them, which was disavowed by the greater part.* And shews how the first Tumults in *Francis* II. his time, were carried mainly on by *Renaudy* a Papist, who had Associates of both Religions. He vindicates what followed from

the Intereſt the Princes of the Blood had in the Government in the minority of the Kings. And what followed in *Henry* III. his time, he ſhews, was in defence of the King of *Navarre*, the righteous heir of the Crown, whom thoſe of the League deſigned to ſeclude from his right. But after that *Henry* IV. had ſetled *France*, he not only granted the Proteſtants free Exerciſe of their Religion, but gave them ſome Towns for their ſecurity, to be kept by them for twenty years: at the end whereof, the late King remanding them, the Proteſtants were inſtant to keep them longer, to which he yielded for three or four years: in the end, *he wiſely determined* (ſaith that Gentleman) *to take them out of their hands.* Upon which they met in an Aſſembly at *Rochel*; and *moſt imprudently*, he adds, *and againſt their duty, both to* God *and the King, they reſolved to keep them ſtill by force.* But at that time there was a *National Synod at Alais*, where *M. du Moulin* preſided, who ſearching into the poſture of Affairs in that Country, where many of theſe places of ſtrength lay, he found the greater and better part inclined to yield them up to the King: upon which he wrote an excellent Letter to the *Aſſembly at Rochel*, diſſwading them from purſuing the Courſes they were ingaging in: where he ſhews, it was *the general deſire of their Churches, that it might pleaſe* God *to continue peace*

peace by their giving Obedience to the King: and since his Majesty was resolved to have these Places in his own hands, that they would not on that account ingage in a War. But that if Persecution was intended against them, all who feared God *desired it might be for the Profession of the Gospel, and so be truly the cross of* Christ: *and therefore assured them the greater and better part of their Churches desired they would dissolve their meeting, if it could be with security to their Persons.* And presses their parting from that Assembly, with many Arguments, and obviates what might be objected against it: And craves pardon to tell them, *They would not find inclinations in those of the Religion to obey their resolutions, which many of the best quality, and greatest capacity avowedly condemned, judging that to suffer on that account, was not to suffer for the Cause of* God. And therefore exhorts them to depend on *God*, and not precipitate themselves into Ruin by their Impatience. And he ends his Letter with the warmest and ferventest language imaginable for gaining them into his opinion. It is true, his Letter wrought not the desired Effect, yet many upon it deserted the meeting. Upon the which that Gentleman shews, that what was then done, ought not to be charged on the Protestant Churches of *France*, since it was condemned by the *National Synod of their Divines*, and three parts of four who were

of the Religion continued in their dutiful Obedience to the King, without ingaging in Arms with those of their Party. *Amirald* also in his incomparable *Apology* for those of the *Reformed Religion, Sect.* 2. vindicates them from the imputations of disloyalty to their Prince: and after he hath asserted his own opinion, that Prayers and Tears ought to be the only weapons of the Church, as agreeing best with the nature of the Gospel, and the practice of the first Christians, he adds his regrates, that their Fathers did not crown their other Virtues with invincible Patience, in suffering all the Cruelty of their Persecutors without resistance, after the Example of the Primitive Church, by which all color of reproaching the Reformation had been removed. Yet he shews how they held out during the Reign of *Francis* I. and *Henry* II. notwithstanding all the Cruelty of the Persecution, though their Numbers were great. What fell out after that, he justifies, or rather excuses (*for he saith, he cannot praise, but blame it*) on the Grounds we have already mentioned, of the minority of their Kings, and of the Interest of the Princes of the Blood. And for the business of *Renaudy* in *Francis* II. his time, he tells how *Calvin* disapproved it: and observes from *Thuan.* that he who first discovered it was of the Reformed Religion, and did it purely from the

the Dictate of his Conſcience. He alſo ſhews that the Proteſtants never made War with a common Conſent, till they had the Edicts on their ſide, ſo that they defended the King's Authority, which others were violating. But adds withal, that the true cauſe of the Wars, was reaſon of State, and a Faction betwixt the Houſes of *Bourbon* and *Guiſe*: and the defence of the Proteſtants was pretended, to draw them into it. And for the late Wars, he charges the blame of them on the ambition of ſome of their Grandees, and the factious Inclinations of the Town of *Rochel*. And vindicates the reſt of their Church from acceſſion to them, whatever good wiſhes the common Intereſt of their Religion might have drawn from them, for theſe whoſe danger they ſo much apprehended. And for the Affairs of our *Britain*, which was then in a great Combuſtion, for which the Proteſtants were generally blamed, as if the Genius of their Religion led to an oppoſition of Monarchy, he ſaith, ſtrangers could not well judge of matters ſo remote from them; but if the King of *England* was by the conſtitutions of that Kingdom a Sovereign Prince (which is a thing in which he cannot well offer a diciſion) then he ſimply condemns their raiſing a War againſt him, even though that report which was ſo much ſpread of his deſign to change the Reformed Religion ſettled there,

were true. Neither are these opinions of *Amirald* to be look'd on as his private thoughts; but that Apology being published by the approbation of these appointed to license the Books of the Religion, is to be received as the more common and received Doctrine of that Church.

And what ever approbation or assistance the neighboring Princes might have given the Protestants in the latter or former Wars, it will not infer their allowing the Precedent of Subjects resisting their Sovereign, though persecuted by him, since it is not to be imagined many Princes could be guilty of that. But the Maxims of Princes running too commonly upon grounds very different from the Rules of Conscience, and tending chiefly to strengthen themselves, and weaken their Neighbors, we are not to make any great account of their approving or abetting of these Wars. And thus far you have drawn from me a great deal of Discourse for justifying the *Conformists* design of vindicating the Reformed Churches from the Doctrine and Practice of Subjects resisting their Sovereign, upon pretexts of Religion.

Isot. A little time may produce an Answer to all this, which I will not now attempt, but study these accounts more accurately. But let us now come home to *Scotland*, and examine whether the King be an accountable Prince, or not? You know

know well enough how *Fergus* was first called over by the *Scots*, how many instances there are of the States their coërcing the King, how the King must swear at his Coronation to observe the Laws of the Kingdom, upon which Allegiance is sworn to him, so that if he break his part, why are not the Subjects also free, since the Compact seems mutual? I need not add to this, that the King can neither make nor abrogate Laws, without the consent of the Estates of Parliament, that he can impose no Tax without them. And from these things it appears that the King of *Scotland* is a limited King, who as he originally derived his Power from their choice, so is still limited by them, and liable to them. All which is at large made out by the Author of *Jus populi*.

Basil. Now you are on a rational Point, which I acknowledge deserves to be well discussed, for if by the Laws of *Scotland* the King be liable to his People, then their coërcing him will be no Rebellion. But this point is to be determined not from old Stories, about which we have neither Record, nor clear account for giving light how to direct our belief, nor from some tumultuary Practices, but from the Laws and Records of the Kingdom: and here the first word of our Laws gives a shrewd Indication that the King's Power is not from the People, (which is *anno*

1024, according to Sir *John Skeen*'s Collection of them:) *King* Malcome *gave and distributed all his Lands of the Realm of* Scotland *among his men, and reserved nothing in property to himself but the Royal Dignity, and the* Mute-hill *in the Town of* Scone.

Now I dare appeal to any Person whether this be not the Stile of a Sovereign, and if this prove not the King's Title to the Crown to be of another nature, than that of a voluntary Compact? The next vestige is to be found in the Books of *Regiam Majestatem*, held to be published by King *David* I. *Anno* 1124, and declared authentical by following Parliaments, where the third Verse of the Preface is, *That our most glorious King having the Government of the Realm, may happily live both in the time of Peace and of warfare, and may rule the Realm committed to him by* God, *who hath no Superior but the Creator of Heaven and Earth, ruler over all things*, &c. And let the plain sense of these words tell whether the King of *Scotland*, hath his power from the People, and whether he be accountable to any but to *God*? It is also clear that all were bound to follow the King to the Wars, and punishment was decreed against those who refused it, see the Laws of *Alexander* II. *Cap.* 15. and *Jac.* 1. *Parl.* 1. *Cap.* 4. *Jac.* 2. *p.* 13. *Cap.* 57. And this shews they were far from allowing War

War againſt the King. The Parliaments were alſo originally the Kings Courts, at which all his Vaſſals were bound to appear perſonally, and give him Counſel, which proving a burden to the ſmall Barons, they were diſpenced with for their appearance in Parliament, 1. *Jac. Parl. 7. cap.* 101. which ſhews that the coming to the Parliament was looked on in theſe days rather as an homage due to the King, than a priviledg belonging to the Subjects, otherwiſe they had been loth to have parted with it ſo eaſily. And 2. *Jac. 6. Parl. cap.* 14. *It is ordained that none rebel againſt the King's perſon nor his Authority, and whoſo makes ſuch Rebellion is to be puniſhed after the quality and quantity of ſuch Rebellion by the advice of the three Eſtates. And if it happens any within the Realm openly or notoriouſly to rebel againſt the King, or make war againſt the King's Lieges, againſt his forbidding; in that caſe the King is to go upon them with aſſiſtance of the whole Lands, and to puniſh them after the quantity of the treſpaſs.* Here ſee who hath the Sovereign power, and whether any may take Arms againſt the King's command: and the 25. *Ch.* of that ſame Parl. defines the points of Treaſon. It is true by that Act thoſe who aſſault Caſtles, or Houſes where the King's perſon was, without the conſent of the three Eſtates, are to be puniſhed as Traytors: From which one may infer that the Eſtates may beſiege the King; but it is clear

clear that was only a proviſion againſt theſe who in the minority of the Kings uſed to ſeize upon their Perſons, and ſo aſſumed the Government: and therefore it was very reaſonable that in ſuch a caſe proviſion ſhould be made, that it were not Treaſon for the Eſtates to come and beſiege a place where the Kings Perſon were for recovering him from ſuch as treaſonably ſeized on him. And this did clearly take its riſe from the confuſions were in that King's minority, whom ſometimes the Governor, ſometimes the Chancellor got into their keeping, and ſo carried things as they pleaſed having the young King in their hands. The King is alſo declared to have full Juriſdiction and free Empire within his Realm, 3. *Jac. Parl.* 5. *cap.* 30. And all along it is to be obſerved that in aſſerting his Majeſties *Prerogative Royal*, the phraſes of *aſſerting* and *acknowledging*, but never of *giving* or *granting*, are uſed, ſo that no part of the King's Prerogative is granted him by the Eſtates, and *Jac.* 6. *Parl.* 8. *cap.* 129. his Majeſties Royal Power and Authority over all Eſtates, as well ſpiritual as temporal, within the Realm, is ratified, approved, and perpetually confirmed in the perſon of the King's Majeſty his Heirs and Succeſſors. And in the 15. *Parl.* of that ſame King, *Chap.* 251. theſe words are, *Albeit it cannot be denied, but his Majeſty is a free Prince,*

of

of a Sovereign Power, having as great liberties and Prerogatives by the Laws of this Realm and priviledg of his Crown, and Diadem, as any other King, Prince, or Potentate whatsoever. And in the 18. *Parl.* of the same *King*, Act. 1. *The Estates and whole body of that present Parliament, all in one voluntary, faithful and united heart, mind and consent, did truly acknowledg his Majesties Sovereign Authority, Princely Power, Royal Prerogative, and priviledg of his Crown over all Estates, Persons and Causes within his said Kingdom* By this time I suppose it is past debate, that by the Tract of the whole Laws of *Scotland*, his Majesty is a Sovereign unaccountable Prince, since nothing can be devised more expres than are the Acts I have cited. For what you objected from the Coronation Oath, remember what was said a great while ago, that if by the Coronation the King got his Power, so that the Coronation Oath, and Oath of Allegiance were of the nature of a mutual stipulation, then you might with some reason infer that a failing of the one side, did free the other; but nothing of that can be alledged here, where the King hath his Authority, how soon the breath of his Father goes out, and acts with full Regal power before he be crowned; so that the Coronation is only a solemn inauguration in that which is already his right. Next, let me tell you, that the King's swearing

at

at his Coronation, is but a late practice; and ſo the Title of the Kings of *Scotland* to the Crown, is not upon the ſwearing of that Oath: And here I ſhall tell you all that I can find in our Laws of the King's ſwearing or promiſing. The firſt inſtance that meets me is, *Chap.* 17. of the Statutes of King *Robert* the Second, where theſe words are, *For fulfilling and obſerving of all the premiſes, the King ſo far as concerns him in his Parliament, hath obliged himſelf in the word of a Prince, and his Son the Earl of Carrict* (afterwards *Robert* the third) *being conſtituted by the King for fulfilling of the premiſes, ſo far as touches him, gave and made his Oath, the holy Evangils being touched by him, and then the States of Parliament did alſo ſwear to maintain the Earl of Carrict*, made then Lieutenant under the King. Now the reaſon why theſe mutual Oaths were then given, is well known, ſince the King's Succeſſion was ſo doubtful. But after that, no Oath ſeems to have been given: and tho King *James* the Second his Coronation be ſet down in the Records of Parliament, there is not a word of an Oath given by any in his Name. It is true in the 11. *Parl.* of that King, *cap* 41. for ſecuring of the Crown-lands from being alienated, it is appointed, *That the King who then was, ſhould be ſworn; and in like manner all his Succeſſors, Kings of Scotland into their Coronation, to the keeping of that Statute,*

Statute, and all the points thereof. But this is not ſuch an Oath as you alledg. Likewiſe in King *James* the Fourth his Reign, 2. *Parl. Ch.* 12. where the Council was ſworn, it is added, *And our Sovereign Lord hath humbled his Highneſs to promit and grant in Parliament, to abide and remain at their Counſels while the next Parliament.* But it is to be obſerved, the King was then but 17 years old, and ſo not of full age: this promiſe was alſo a temporary proviſion. Beſides, the very ſtile of it ſhews, that it was below his Majeſty to be ſo bound. But the firſt Act for a Coronation Oath I can meet with, is *Cap.* 8. of the 1. *Parl.* of King *James* the Sixth, *An.* 1567. where the ſtile wherein the Act runs, ſhews it was a new thing, it bearing no narrative of any ſuch former Cuſtom: the words of the Act are, *Item, becauſe that the increaſe of Vertue and ſuppreſſing of Idolatry craves, that the Prince and the people be of one perfect Religion, which of GOD'S mercy is now preſently profeſſed within this Realm; Therefore it is ſtatute and ordained by our Sovereign Lord, my Lord Regent, and the three Eſtates of this preſent Parliament, that all Kings and Princes, or Magiſtrates whatſoever, holding their place, which hereafter may happen to Reign, and bear Rule over this Realm, at the time of their Coronation, and receipt of their Princely authority, make their faithful promiſe by Oath,* &c. Now you ſee the beginning of the Coro-

Coronation Oath, and I need not here reflect on the time when that Act passed, it being so obvious to every one. But I suppose it is made out, that the Kings of *Scotland* have not their Authority from any stipulation used at their Coronation. The next thing you alledg to prove the King of *Scotland* a limited Prince, is, because he must govern by Laws, which cannot be enacted without the Authority of the three Estates in Parliament: But this will not serve turn, unless you prove that the Estates can cognosce on the King, and coerce him if he transgress: for which there is not a tittle in our Laws. I acknowledg the Constitution of Parliaments to be both a rational and excellent Model, and that the King becomes a Tyrant when he violates their Priviledges, and governs without Law: But tho his Ministers who serve him in such tyrannical ways are liable to punishment by the Law, yet himself is subject to none but *GOD*. And from our Kings their Justice and goodness in governing legally by the Councils of their Parliaments, you have no reason to argue against their absolute Authority; for their binding themselves to such Rules, and being tied to the observance of Laws enacted by themselves, will never overthrow their Authority, but rather commend it, as having such a temperature of Sovereignty, Justice, and Goodness in it.

Vet.

Iſot. But was not King *James* the Third reſiſted and killed in the Field of *Striveling*, and afterwards in his Sons firſt *Parl. Act.* 14. all who were againſt him in that Field, were declared innocent, and his ſlaughter was declared to be his own fault, which was never reſcinded? As alſo *Cap.* 130. of *Jac.* 6. *Parl.* 8. the Honour and Authority of Parliament upon the free Vote of the three Eſtates thereof is aſſerted. And are not you an impugner of the Authority of the three Eſtates, who plead thus for the King's Sovereign Power? *See Anſwer to the Letter written to the Author of Jus Populi.*

Baſil. I ſhall not engage far in the Story of King *James* the Third, which even as it is repreſented by *Buchanan, lib.* 11. (no friend to Monarchy) is very far from being juſtifiable on the ſide of thoſe who fought againſt him: nor was it the leaſt part of their guilt, that they forced his Son, being then but fifteen years old, to own their Rebellion: And what wonder was it, that they who had killed the Father, and kept his Son in their power, paſſed ſuch an Act in their own favors? But King *James* the Fourth quickly diſcovered what a ſincere Penitent he was for his Acceſſion to that Rebellion, as appeared by the Iron Belt he wore all his life, as a penance for this ſin: yet the meekneſs of his Spirit, and the power of that Faction, made that things

things continued in the posture they formerly were in. It is true, that Act was not expressly repelled, which perhaps was not safe at that time to have attempted: but it was really done by his Revocation ratified in his 6. *Parl. cap.* 100. wherein with consent of the three Estates, *He annuls and revokes all Statutes and Acts of Parliament which he had enacted in his former years, that tended either to the prejudice of the Catholic Church, his Soul, or of the Crown, declaring them to have no force, but to be deleted, and cancell'd out of the Books.* And it is not to be doubted, but in this he had an eye to that former Act: but for your Act asserting the Authority of Parliament, look but what immediately precedes it, and you will find the King's Authority and Supremacy fully established: and I acknowledg, that whosoever impugns the Authority of Parliament, as the King's Great Council, doth incur a very high punishment; but this will never prove an Authority in the States to coerce and resist the King. One thing I must mind you of from that Act, which is, *That none of the Lieges must presume to impugn the dignity and Authority of the said three Estates, or to seek or procure the innovation, or diminution of the Power and Authority of the same three Estates, or any of them in time coming, under the pain of Treason.* And can you be so ignorant of our Laws, as not to know that the Church

was

was one of these Estates: for the small Barons which some called the Third Estate, came not in till three years after? *Jac.* 6. *Parl.* 11. *cap.* 113. And now from all these premises, I think we may fairly infer with Sir *John Sheen*, *Title* 8. of the heads of our Laws drawn up by him, *That all Jurisdiction stands and consists in the King's Person by reason of his Royal Authority and Crown, and is competent to no Subject, but flows and proceeds from the King, having Supreme Jurisdiction, and is given and committed by him to such Subjects as he pleases.*

Eud. I must confess my self pleased with this discussion of these points you have been tossing among you: and though I have sate silent, yet I have followed the thread of all your discourse with much close attention; and was mightily confirmed in my former Perswasion, both by the evidence of Reason, the authorities of Scripture, and these instances of History were adduced. But there are many other things yet to be talked of, though I confess this be of the greatest Importance: and the satisfaction I have received in this, makes me long to hear you handle the other matters in debate.

Phil. I suppose we have forgot little that belonged to this question: but for engaging further at this time, I have no mind to it, it being so long passed Midnight: we shall therefore

give ſome truce to our debates, and return upon the next appointment.

Eud. I were unworthy of the kindneſs you ſhew me, did I importune you too much: but I will preſume upon your friendſhip for me, to expect your company to Morrow at the ſame hour you did me the favor to come here to day.

Iſot. I ſhall not fail to keep your hour, tho I be hardly beſet in ſuch a croud of Aſſailants; but Truth is on my ſide, and it is great, and ſhall prevail, therefore good night to you.

Baſil. I ſee you are not ſhaken out of your confidence for all the foils you get, yet our next days diſcourſe will perhaps humble you a little more; but I refer this to the appointment wherein we hope to meet again, and ſo, Adieu.

Eud. Adieu, to you all, my good Friends.

THE

THE SECOND CONFERENCE.

Eudaimon.

YOU are again welcome to this place, and ſo much the more, that your ſtaying ſome minutes later than the appointment, was making me doubt of your coming: and indeed this delay proved more tedious, and ſeemed longer to me than the many hours were beſtowed on your yeſterdays *Conference*: but methinks, *Iſotimus*, your looks, though never very ſerene, have an unuſual Cloud upon them; I doubt you have been among the *Brotherhood*, whom your ingenious Relation of what paſſed here, hath offended. Their Temper is pretty well known to us all, ſome of them being *as the Peſtilence that walketh in darkneſs*, with the no leſs zealous, but ſcarcely more ignorant, *Siſterhood*, they vent their pedling ſtuff: but of all things in the World ſhun moſt to engage

with any that can unmask them, and diſcover their follies. And their ſafeſt way of dealing with ſuch Perſons, is, to laugh at them, or ſolemnly to pity them with a diſdainful Brow. And that is the beſt refutation they will beſtow on the ſolideſt Reaſon, or if any of them yelp out with an Anſwer, ſenſe or nonſenſe, all is alike; the premiſes are never examined, only if the concluſion be poſitively vouched, as clearly proved from Scriptures and Reaſon, the ſentence is irreverſibly paſt, and you may as ſoon bow an Oak of an hundred years old, as deal with ſo much ſupercilious Ignorance. Tell plainly, have you been in any ſuch Company?

Iſot. What wild extravagant ſtuff pour you out on better men than your ſelf? but I pity your ignorance who know not ſome of theſe precious Worthies, whoſe Shooe Latchets you are not worthy to unlooſe. But the truth is, you have got me here among you, and bait me by turns, either to eaſe your own Galls, or to try mine; yet it is needleſs to attempt upon me, for as I am not convinced by your Reaſons, ſo I will not be behind with you in Reflections: and I will crow and fight both, as a Cock of the Game.

Baſil. Hold, hold, for theſe ſerve to no uſe but to rankle peeviſh humors, I will therefore engage

engage you in another ſubject about the Civil Authority, which our yeſterdays debate left untouched; which is *the obedience due to their Commands: let us therefore conſider how far Subjection obligeth us to obey the Laws of the Civil Powers.*

Iſot. Had you not enough of that yeſterday? Is it not enough that the Magiſtrate be not reſiſted? but will not that ſerve turn with you? or do you deſign that we ſurrender our Conſciences to him, and obey all his Laws, good or bad, and follow *Leviathan*'s Doctrine of embracing the Magiſtrates Faith without enquiry? which is bravely aſſerted by the *Author of Eccleſiaſtical Policy.* This is indeed to make the King in *God*'s ſtead, and to render *Ceſar* the things that are *God*'s, which is a viſible deſign either for Popery or Atheiſm.

Philar. Truly, Sir, you conſider little, if you judge ſubmiſſion to the Penalties of the Laws, to be all the duty we owe Superiors. It is true, where the Legiſlators leave it to the Subjects choice, either to do a thing enacted, or to pay a Fine; in that Caſe, Obedience is not ſimply required; ſo that he who pays the Mulct, fulfils his Obligation. But where a Law is ſimply made, and Obedience enjoined, and a Penalty fixed on Diſobedience, in that Caſe, nothing but the ſinfulneſs of the Command can

excuſe our diſobedience: neither can it be ſaid, that he ſins not who is content to ſubmit to the puniſhment, ſince by the ſame method of arguing you may prove that ſuch horrid Atheiſts, as ſay they are content to be damned, do not ſin againſt *God*, ſince they are willing to ſubmit to the threatned puniſhment. The right of exacting our Obedience is therefore to be diſtinguiſhed from the power of puniſhing our faults. And as we have already conſidered how far the latter is to be acquieſced in, it remains to be examined what is due to the former. But here I lay down for a Principle, *That whatever is determined by the Law of* God, *cannot be reverſed, nor countermanded by any humane Law:* For the Powers that are, being ordained of *God*, and they being his Miniſters, do act as his Deputies: and the tie which lies on us to obey *God*, being the foundation of our ſubjection to them, it cannot bind us to that which overthrows it ſelf: Therefore it is certain *God* is firſt to be obeyed; and all the Laws of men which contradict his Authority or Commands, are null, and void of all obligation on our Obedience: but I muſt add, it is one of the arts of *you know whom*, to faſten Tenets on men who judge theſe Tenets worthy of the higheſt *Anathema*. For if it be maintained, that the Magiſtrate can bind obligations on our Conſciences,

then

then it will be told in every Conventicle, that here a new Tyranny is brought upon Souls, which are *God*'s Prerogative, though this be nothing more than to say we ought *to be subject for Conscience sake.* If again it be proved that the determining of the externals of Government or Worship, falls within the Magistrate's Sphere, then comes in a new Complaint, and it is told, that here Religion is given up to the Lusts and Pleasure of men, though it be an hundred times repeated, that command what the King will in prejudice of the Divine Law, no Obedience is due. If again it be proved that Church Judicatories, in what notions soever, are subjects, as well as others, and no less tied to obedience than others; upon this come in vehement outcries, as if the Throne and Kingdom of *Christ* were overturned and betrayed, with other such like Expressions in their harsh Stile. What is become of Mankind and of Religion, when Ignorants triumph upon these barren Pretences, as if they were the only Masters of Reason, and directors of Conscience? You know what my Temper is in most differences: but I acknowledge my mind to be full of a just disdain of these ignorant, and insolent Pedlers; which is the more inflamed, when I consider the Ruins, not only of sound Learning, but of true Piety, and the common rules of Humanity,

which follow these simple Contests they make about nothing.

Basil. To speak freely, I cherish Reflections no where, therefore I shall not conceal my mislike of these Invectives, which though I am forced to confess, are just; yet I love to hear truth and peace pleaded for with a calm serene Temper: and though the intolerable and peevish railings of these Pamphlets do justifie a severe Procedure, yet I would have the softer and milder methods of the Gospel used, that so we may *overcome evil with good.* To take you therefore off that angry engagement, let me invite you to a sober Examen of the Magistrates Authority in things Divine. But before this be engaged in, let it be first considered whether there be any Legislative Power on Earth about things Sacred: and next, with whom it is lodged.

Isot. I will so far comply with your desires, that for this once without retaliating, I quit to *Philarcheus* the last word of scolding. But to come to the purpose you have suggested, consider that *Christ* hath given us a complete Rule, wherein *are all things that pertain to Life and Godliness.* It is then an Imputation on his Gospel, to say any thing needs be added to it, and that it contains not a clear direction for all things; therefore they accuse his Wisdom or Goodness, who pretend to add to his Laws, and wherein he

he hath not burthened our Conſciences: what tyranny is it to bind *a yoak upon us which our Fathers were not able to bear?* Whereby as our Chriſtian liberty is invaded, ſo innumerable Schiſms and Scandals ſpring from no other thing ſo much, as from theſe oppreſſions of Conſcience, which are ſo much the more unjuſt, that the impoſers acknowledging their indifferency, and the refuſers ſcrupling their lawfulneſs, the peace of the Church is ſacrificed to what is acknowledged indifferent: neither can any bounds be fixed to thoſe impoſitions; for if one particular may be added, why not more and more ſtill, till the yoak become heavier than that of *Moſes* was? which is made out from experience: For the humor of innovating in divine matters having once crept into the Church, it never ſtopp'd till it ſwelled to that prodigious bulk of Rites, under which the *Roman Church* lies oppreſſed. And beſides all theſe general conſiderations, there is one particular againſt ſignificant Rites, which is, that the inſtituting of them in order to a particular ſignification of any Grace, makes them Sacraments, according to the vulgar definition of Sacraments, that they are the outward ſigns of an inward Grace: but the inſtituting of Sacraments, is by the confeſſion of all, a part of Chriſt's Prerogative, ſince he who confers grace, can only inſtitute the

ſigns

ſigns of it. Upon all theſe accounts, I plead the Rule of Scripture to be that which ought to determine about all divine matters, and that no binding Laws ought to be made in divine things wherein we are left at liberty by *GOD*, who is the only Maſter of our Conſciences. *See from pag.* 172. *to pag.* 180.

Phil. You have now given me a full Broadſide, after which I doubt not but you triumph as if you had ſhattered me all to pieces: but I am afraid you ſhall find this Volley of charmed Ball hath quite miſſed me, and that I be aboard of you ere you be aware. No man can with more heartineſs acknowledg the compleatneſs of Scripture than my ſelf: and one part of it is, that all things which tend to Order, Edification and Peace be done, and the Scene of the World altering ſo, that what now tends to advance Order, Edification, and Peace, may afterwards occaſion diſorder; deſtruction and contention, the Scripture had not been compleat, if in theſe things there were not an Authority on Earth, to make and unmake Laws in things indifferent. I acknowledg the *adding of new pieces of worſhip*, hath ſo many inconveniencies hanging about it, that I ſhould not much patronize it: but the determining of what may be done, either in this or that faſhion to any particular Rule, is not of that nature: Therefore, ſince Worſhip muſt be

in

in a certain posture, a certain habit, in a determinate place, and on such times, all these being of one kind; Laws made about them upon the accounts of order, edification, or peace, do not pretend to prejudg the perfection of Scripture, by any additions to what it prescribes; since no new thing is introduced: Indeed did humane Law-givers pretend that by their Laws these things became of their own nature more acceptable to *GOD*, they should invade *GOD*'s Prerogative; but when they are prescribed only upon the account of Decency and Order, it is intolerable peevishness to call a thing indifferent of its nature, unlawful, because commanded: For the Christian liberty consists in the exemption of our Consciences from all humane yoak, but not of our actions, which are still in the power of our Superiors, till they enjoin what is sinful, and then a greater than they is to be obeyed. I acknowledg, the simplicity of the *Christian Religion* is one of its chief Glories, nothing being enjoined in it but what is most properly fitted for advancing the Souls of men towards that wherein their blessedness doth consist: And therefore I never reflect without wonder, on that Censure *Ammian Marcellin*, a Heathen Writer, gives of *Constantius*, *That he confounded the Christian Religion, which was of it self pure and simple, with doating superstitions:*

So

So I freely acknowledg that whoſoever introduce new parts of Worſhip, as if they could commend us to *GOD*, do highly encroach on *GOD*'s Authority, and man's Liberty. But as for the determining of things that may be done in a variety of ways into one particular form, ſuch as the preſcribing a ſet form for Worſhip, the ordering the poſture in Sacraments, the habit in Worſhip, determinate times for commemorating great mercies, the time how long a Sinner muſt declare his penitence, ere he be admitted to the uſe of the Sacraments, and the like (which is all in queſtion among us) they are quite of another nature. And it is a ſtrange piece of nicety, if in theſe things, becauſe Superiours command what ſeems moſt proper for expreſſing the inward ſenſe we ought to have of things, that therefore theſe injunctions become criminal, and not to be obeyed. For the ſignificancy alledged to be in them, is only a dumb way of expreſſing our inward thoughts; and as we agree to expreſs them by words, ſo ſome outward ſigns may be alſo uſed: as by ſackcloth the penitent expreſſeth his ſorrow, and by a Surplice a Church-man expreſſeth his purity; ſo thoſe habits are only a ſilent way of ſpeaking out the ſenſe of the heart. Only here on the way, if you have a mind to eaſe your ſpleen a little, read what that late Pamphlet

ſaith

ſaith, to prove a diſtinction betwixt theſe two Ceremonies, *pag.* 111. That vulgar Sophiſm of making Sacraments, is the pooreſt Cavil imaginable: for a Sacrament is a federate Rite of ſtipulating with *GOD*, wherein as we plight our faith to *GOD*, ſo he viſibly makes offer of his Goſpel to us, which he accompanies with the gracious effuſions of his Spirit: and indeed to inſtitute any ſuch Rite, were the higheſt encroachment on the divine Authority: But what Sophiſtry will faſten a pretenſion to this on the inſtitution of a Right, which ſhall only ſignifie that Duty a creature ows his Maker and Redeemer, tending both to quicken the perſon that performs it to a ſence of it, as alſo to work upon Spectators by ſuch a grave ſolemn Rite? To ſay Men can inſtitute means of conveying the divine Grace, is juſtly to be condemned; but how far differs it from that, to uſe ſigns, as well as words, for expreſſing our duty to *GOD*? Thus you ſee how ill founded that pompous Argument is, with which we have heard many triumphing among Ignorants, or where none could contradict them.

Crit. If I may have liberty to add a little, I would ſuggeſt ſomewhat of the true Notion of *Chriſtian Liberty*, and how it is to be made uſe of, or reſtrained. For the clearing whereof, we are to call to mind how upon the firſt promulgation

of

of the Gospel, a Contention did early rise about the observation of *Moses Law*, the stipulation whereto was given in Circumcision; the *Judaizers* pleaded its continuance, and the *Apostles* asserted the *Christian Liberty*: the *Judaizers* pretended a divine Obligation from *Moses his Law*; the *Apostles* proved that was now vacated by the death of CHRIST, which freed all from that Yoak, and that therefore to be circumcised, as a stipulation to *Moses's Law*, was to continue subject to that Yoak, and so to deny the *Messias* was yet come, by which CHRIST should profit them nothing. But the authority of *Paul* and *Barnabas* not being great enough to settle that Question, they were sent from *Antioch* to the *Apostles*, and *Presbyters* at *Jerusalem*, who determined against the necessity of Circumcision, and consequently of the observation of the *Mosaical Law*, and appointed that these who were proselyted from *Gentilism* to the *Christian Faith*, should be received, not as *Proselytes of Justice*, but as *Proselytes of the Gates*, who were only bound to obey the seven Precepts of the Sons of *Noah*; which I stand not to make out, it being sufficiently cleared already by others. Here then the *Christian Liberty* was stated in an exemption from *the Law of Moses*. But for all this, we see into what compliances the *Apostles* consented, for gaining upon the *Jews* by that

con-

condeſcenſion, they Circumciſe, they Purifie (which was done by ſprinkling with the aſhes of the red Cow) they take the Vows of *Nazariſm*, they keep the Feaſts at *Jeruſalem* (which I wonder how that Pamphleteer could deny, *pag.* 301. it being mentioned expreſly, *Acts* 18. 21.) and upon the whole matter Saint *Paul* gives the following Rules and Aſſertions.

The firſt was, that theſe things did not commend a Man to *GOD*: *For the Kingdom of GOD conſiſted not in meat and drink*, (which clearly relates to the *Moſaical* differencing of Meats, clean and unclean) *that neither Circumciſion nor uncircumciſion availed any thing*. And if neither branch of that Controverſie did of its own nature commend men to *GOD*; what judgments may we paſs on our trifling wranglings? Whence we may infer, that we ought to inſtruct all *Chriſtians in the Faith*, but not in theſe doubtful Diſputations.

The next Aſſertion is, That even in theſe matters men might be acceptable to GOD, on which ſide ſoever they were, ſo they judged what they did was done to GOD. He that made diſtinction of Days, or Meats, *made it to the LORD, and he that regarded them not to the LORD, he regarded them not.* So that GOD may be acceptably ſerved by ſeveral men

men doing things contrary one to another.

Another Rule is, That in these things every Man must be fully perſuaded in his own mind, and proceed out of a clear conviction in his Conſcience.

A fourth Rule is, That in theſe matters none ought to preſcribe or dictate to another: ſuch as had a liberty in them, were not to deſpiſe the ſcrupulous, as unreaſonable; neither were theſe who ſcrupled at them, to judg ſuch as acted in a higher Sphere of Liberty, as profane or licentious: ſo that all were to be remitted to *GOD's Judgment Seat.*

Another Rule is, That for *the Peace of the Church*, many things which are otherwiſe ſubject to great inconveniencies, may be done for the gaining our Brethren: but if ſuch compliance harden people in their imperious humor, what was formerly to be done for gaining upon them, becomes unfit when ſo abuſed by them; and therefore if after we have complied with the weak exceptions of others, in matters indifferent, they become ſo hardy as to preſume upon our goodneſs to invade our Liberty, by enjoying ſuch things as neceſſary, pretending to an authority over us; *we are not to give place by ſubjection to ſuch, no not for an hour.*

The laſt Rule is, That in matters of indifferency, we are to poſtpone our own inclinations or

deſires

deſires, when the hazard of our brother's ſtumbling, or of the Peace of the Church lies in our way.

All theſe are ſo clearly aſſerted by S. *Paul*, and withal are ſo oppoſite to our preſent Heats, that I wiſh they were more minded by the troublers of our *Iſrael*, and they would certainly give a ſpeedy deciſion to theſe Feuds about doubtful diſputations, which have ſo long preyed on the *Peace of the Church*.

Baſil. And I am ſure if ſo great a Compliance may be given to the weakneſs of our brethren, much more is due to the commands of our Superiors; except you ſay, we are more ſubject to equals than to Superiors, or that the weakneſs of a Brother ſhould weigh more than the authority of a Father: And in fine, that the Obligations of *Charity* ſhould be more prevalent than thoſe of *Juſtice*; *Obedience* being a debt we owe, whereas *Compliance* is a Benevolence given. I do not deny but great caution and tenderneſs muſt be uſed in making of ſuch Laws, and that their fitneſs for attaining the ends of *order, edification and peace*, ſhould be well conſidered, and they no longer adhered to, than theſe effects can be drawn from them: ſo that if the nature of Circumſtances which vary all things indifferent, come to change, the ſame reaſon that exacted their being firſt impoſed, will plead a

change. I also acknowledge, that great abuse hath followed upon the innovating and prescribing in *Divine matters*, and that nothing hath occasioned more *divisions among Christians*, than the overstraining an *Uniformity*. But if because of abuses you overturn all *Legislative Power* in matters sacred, nothing that is humane shall scape your fury, since every thing is subject to abuse. And nothing will curb ones Career till he turn *Quaker*, that follows these Maxims. But one thing is still forgotten, that the *dictates of Reason* are in their kind the *Voice* of *God*; Reason being nothing, save an impress of the Image of *God* on the Soul of man; which because much obliterated by the Fall, was to be supplied by Revelation: but wherein it remains clear, its directions not contradicting any positive or revealed Law, are still to be followed as the Laws of *God*.

Poly. For proving all this, I shall not run so far back as to examine the nature of the *Priesthood, and Sacrifices were before* Moses, to consider whether these flow'd from a *Revelation* conveyed by *Tradition*, or from the *dictates of Reason*? But after *Moses his Law* was given, wherein all was modelled by *Divine prescript*, yet what a vast heap of *additions* did flow upon that worship before our Saviour's days, all that have written on the Temple service do abundantly discover.

Here

Here is a Field ſpacious enough for any that deſigned a vain ſhew of much reading; but a view of *Doctor Lightfoot's Temple-Service* will quickly convince any, that the whole Service of the Temple was interpalated by many Additions, whoſe firſt Author cannot be traced. They alſo uſed *Baptiſm* to all who were proſelyted from *Gentiliſm*. And in the *Paſchal Feſtivity* alone, how many new Rites do we find? Every Schoolboy may know that they had a Diſh, called *Charaſeth*, which was a thick Sawce of Dates, Figs, Almonds, *&c.* pounded together, which looked like Clay, to mind them of the Clay in which their Fathers wrought in *Egypt*, which was a ſignificative Ceremony; and was the Diſh wherein they dipped their hand, which we find was not wanting in our *Lord's* Paſſover; which proves ſignificant Rites, tho of humane appointment, cannot be criminal. And if to this I ſhould add the ſeveral Cups of Wine, the divers removes of the Table, and covering it of new, the frequent waſhing of their hands, and divers other things, I ſhould grow tedious. But our *Lord* never reproves theſe things; nay, on the contrary he ſymbolized with them. It is true, when their Zeal for their *Traditions* made them break the *Commandments of* God, or adhere ſo ſtifly to them, as to judge the Conſciences of ſuch as did not comply with them in

the uſe of them, then he checks their Hypocriſie, and accuſes them, not for the uſe of theſe things, but becauſe they placed all Religion in them, and impoſed the Precepts of men as doctrines. To this I might add the whole frame of the *Synagogues*, both as to *Government*, *Diſcipline and Worſhip*: for whatſoever ſcraps may be brought which may ſeem to prove there were *Synagogues* before the Captivity, which yet is much controverted; yet the form of *Government* in them, the rules of *Excommunication*, and its degrees, together with their *Philacteries*, and ſet *forms of Worſhip*, will never be *proved from Scripture*. Now ſince the *Law* of *God* was no leſs perfect in the *Old Diſpenſation*, than the *Goſpel* is now, it will follow that *Additions* in things purely external and ritual, do no way detract from the Word of *God*: For nothing can be brought to prove the *New Teſtament* a complete Rule for *Chriſtians*, which will not plead the ſame full authority to the *Old Teſtament*, during that *Diſpenſation*; ſince though the *Diſpenſation* was imperfect, yet the Revelation of *God* to them was *able to make them perfect and throughly furniſhed foe every good work*: and the *Scriptures* which S. *Paul* ſaith, *were able to make wiſe to ſalvation*, can be no other than the *Old Teſtament writings*. For beſides that by *Scriptures* nothing elſe is underſtood in the *New Teſta-*

Teſtament, there could be no other *Scripture* known to *Timothy* of a Child, but theſe of the *Old Teſtament*. If then they treſpaſs upon the authority of the *New Teſtament*, and its bleſſed Author, who aſſert a Power to determine about Rituals in Worſhip, or other matters of *Religion*; they committed the ſame Crime who pretended to add to what *Moſes* preſcribed, ſince he was alſo *faithful in all his houſe*. Or if any plead a Divine Warrant for theſe Inſtitutions which were traditionally conveyed, this will open a door for all the pretences of the *Roman Church*, ſince the Expreſſions that cancel *Traditions*, are as full in the *Old Teſtament*, as in the *New*. And thus far I think I have evinced, that there were great additions in Rituals made by the *Jews*, and that theſe were not unlawful, ſince complied with by him who never did amiſs, and yet theſe could have no higher original than humane Authority. I go on to the *New Diſpenſation*, wherein I doubt not to evince, that as for rituals, moſt of theſe they found in the *Synagogue* were retained, without any other change than what that *Diſpenſation* drew after it, and that they took both the Rules of Government, Worſhip and Diſcipline from the *Synagogue*. Therefore the *Epiſtles* do not, when treating of theſe matters, ſpeak in their Stile, who are inſtituting new things; but of thoſe who are giving

directions about what was already received and known: For if new Rules had been to be delivered, the Inſtitution had been expreſs, either in the *Goſpels*, *Acts*, or *Epiſtles*. Now if any will read theſe without prejudice, no ſuch thing will appear: of which manner of Stile, no account can be given; but that things, as to Rituals continued as they were, the uſe of the Sacraments being only inſtituted by *Chriſt*, where the Language of an Inſtitution is expreſs.

About two hundred years after *Chriſt*, outward Penitence was brought into the Church, and ſcandalous Perſons were, according to the nature of Scandals, debarred from the Sacrament for a long ſpace, and were by degrees, and according to the heighth of their Penitence, received to the Communion of the Church, but not after ſome years had paſſed in outward profeſſions of Penitence: and the modelling of this became after that, the chief Care of *Synods* for divers Centuries. Now if one will argue, that though it be true a ſcandalous Perſon ſhould be excommunicated; yet ſince *God* hath mercy at whatſoever time a Sinner repents, ſo ſhould the Church (which only judgeth of the Profeſſion) forgive at whaſoever time one profeſſeth Penitence. It will not be eaſie in your Principles to anſwer this: and ſee how you will clear this practice of Diſcipline from Tyranny, ſince

ſince to debar men from the *Sacraments*, is a greater dominion over Conſciences than the determining about Rituals.

But to come nearer home, there was a certain Society you have heard of *yeleped the Kirk*, which had divers Books of Diſcipline containing rules for that, and a Directory for Worſhip, which had no few rules neither: they had alſo a frame of Government, the Supreme Judicatory whereof was compoſed of three Miniſters, and one ruling Elder from each Presbytery, a ruling Elder beſide from each Burrough, two being allowed the Metropolis, and a Commiſſioner was ſent from each Univerſity; and in this High Court the King came in with the Privilege of a Burgh: for though the Metropolis had two, he was allowed to ſend but one with a ſingle Suffrage to repreſent him; and this Court pretended to an Authority from *Chriſt*, and their Authority was Sacred with no leſs certificate, than *he that deſpiſeth you, deſpiſeth me*. Now how a Power can be committed to delegates without any Commiſſion for it from the Superior, will not be eaſily made out. And they will ſearch long ere they find a Divine Warrant for this Court, unleſs they vouch *Mary Mitchelſons Teſtimony* for it, whoſe hyſterical Diſtempers were given out for Propheſies. And whereas they are ſo tender of *Chriſtian Liberty*, that no

Law must pass about the Rituals of Religion, yet their Books of Discipline and Model of Government, were not only setled by Law, but afterwards sworn to be maintained in the Covenant, wherein they swore *the Preservation of the Reformed Religion in* Scotland, *in Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government.* These were the tender Consciences that could not hear of any Law in *matters indifferent*, and yet would have all swear to their Forms, many of which they could not but know were indifferent: which was a making them necessary at another rate, than is done by a Law which the Legislator can repeal when he will: and never were any in the world more addicted to their own Forms than they were. An instance of this I will give, which I dare say will surprise you: When some designers for popularity in the *Western* parts of that Kirk, did begin to disuse the *Lord's Prayer* in Worship, and the singing the *Conclusion or Doxology* after the *Psalm*, and *the Minister's kneeling for private Devotion* when he entred the Pulpit, the *General Assembly* took this in very ill part, and in a Letter they wrote to the Presbyteries, complained sadly, *Of a Spirit of Innovation was beginning to get into the Kirk, and to throw these laudible practices out of it, mentioning the three I named, which are commanded to be still practised; and such as refused obedience, are appointed to be conferr'd with in order to the*

giving

giving of them ſatisfaction: and if they continu'd untractable, the Presbyteries were to proceed againſt them, as they ſhould be anſwerable to the next general Aſſembly. This Letter I can produce authentically atteſted. But is it not ſtrange, that ſome who were then zealous to condemn theſe Innovations, ſhould now be carried with the herd to be guilty of them? I am become hoarſe with ſpeaking ſo long, and ſo I muſt break off, having, as I ſuppoſe, given many great Precedents from Hiſtory for the uſing of *Rites in divine matters*, without an expreſs Warrant, and for *paſſing Laws* upon theſe, and have cleared the one of Superſtition, and the other of Tyranny.

Eud. Truly, all of you have done your parts ſo well, that even *Iſotimus* himſelf ſeems half convinced: It is then fully clear, that as nothing is to be obtruded on our Belief without clear revelation; ſo no ſacred duty can be bound on our Obedience without a Divine Warrant: but in Rituals, eſpecially in determining what may be done in a variety of ways to one particular Form, there hath been, and ſtill muſt be, a Power on Earth; which provided it balance all things right, and conſider well the fitneſs of theſe Rites, for attaining the deſigned end, doth not invade *God*'s Dominion by making Laws about them: Nor will the pretence of *Chriſtian Liberty* warrant our Diſobedience to them.

them. It remains to be considered, who are vested with this Power, and how much of it belongs to the Magistrate, and how much to the Church.

Basil. I now engage in a Theme which may perhaps lay me open to censure, as if I were courting the Civil Powers by the asserting of their rights: but I am too well known to you to dread your jealously much in this; and I am too little known to my self, if flattery be my foible. I shall therefore with the greatest frankness and ingenuity, lay open my sense of this matter, with the Reasons that prevail with me in it: but I desire first to hear *Isotimus* his opinion about it.

Isot. I do not deny the King hath Authority and Jurisdiction in matters Sacred: but it must be asserted in a due line of Subordination: First, to *Christ* the King of Kings, and the only Head of his Church. And next, to the Rulers and Office-bearers of the Church, who are entrusted by *Christ*, as his Ambassadors, with the Souls of their Flocks, and who must give him an account of their Labors; therefore they must have their Rules only from him who empowers them, and to whom they are subject: They must also have a Power among them to preserve the *Christian Society*; in order to which, they must, according to the *practice of the Apostles*, when

when difficulties emerge, meet together, and conſult what may be for the advancement of the *Chriſtian Religion*; and whoſo refuſeth to hear the Church when ſhe errs not from her Rule, he is to be accounted no better than a *Heathen and a Publican*. And ſince the Church is called one body, they ought to aſſociate together in meetings, ſeeing alſo they have their Power of *Chriſt*, as Mediator, whereas the *Civil Powers* hold of him as he is *God*, they have a different Tenor, diſtinct Ends, and various Rules; therefore the Authority of the Church is among the things of *God*, which only belong to him. And indeed Chriſtians were very ill provided for by *Chriſt*, if they muſt in matters of Religion be ſubject to the pleaſure of ſecular and carnal Men, who will be ready to ſerve their own Intereſts at the rate of the Ruin of every thing that is Sacred. It is true, the *Civil Powers* may and ought to convocate *Synods* to conſult about matters of *Religion*, to require *Church-men* to do their duty, to add their *Sanctions* to *Church Laws*, and to join with the ſounder part for carrying on a *Reformation* But all this is cumulative to the *Churches intrinſick Power, and not privative*; ſo that if the Magiſtrate fall ſhort of his duty, they are notwithſtanding that, to go on as men empowerd by *Jeſus Chriſt*, and *he who deſpiſeth them* (be his qua-

quality what it will) *deſpiſeth him that ſent them.* *See p.* 105. to *p.* 109. and *p.* 467. to *p.* 486.

Baſil. In order to a clear progreſs in this matter, I ſhall firſt diſcuſs the *nature and power of the Church*, by which a ſtep ſhall be made to *the Power the Magiſtrate* may pretend to in matters Sacred. The Apoſtles being ſent by *Jeſus Chriſt*, did every where promulgate the Goſpel, and required ſuch as received it, to meet often together for joint Worſhip, and the free profeſſion of the Faith, wherein they were particularly obliged to the uſe of the Sacraments. The Apoſtles, and after them, all Church-men, were alſo endued with a double Power: The one was declarative for promulgating the Goſpel: the other was directive, which properly is no power; and by this they were to adviſe in ſuch matters wherein they had no warrant to command: So S. *Paul* wrote ſometimes his own ſenſe, which he did by *permiſſion*, and not by *commandment*, only he adviſed, *as one that had obtained mercy to be faithful.* But becauſe *Chriſt* was to be *in his Church to the end of the World*, the things they had heard were to be committed to *faithful men, that they might be able to teach others.* All Church men being thus the Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, they are veſted with a *Divine Authority*, for ſolemn publiſhing the Goſpel; but with this odds from the Apoſtles, *That whereas they*

were

were infallible, their Succeſſors are ſubject to error. And the power of Church-men conſiſts formally in this, that they are *Heralds of the Goſpel*: and by their preaching it, a ſolemn offer of it is made to all their hearers, which to deſpiſe, is to *deſpiſe him that ſent them.* But in this power they are bound up to the Commiſſion they have from God, ſo that what they ſay beyond that, is none of the divine Meſſage. Yet becauſe many particulars may fall in, about which it was impoſſible Rules could be given, they have a directive Authority, which if it be managed as *S. Paul* did, we need fear no tyrannical impoſition from it. And therefore in theſe matters their definitions are not binding Laws, but Rules of advice: for in matters wherein we are left at liberty by God, if Church-men pretend to a Dominion over our Souls, they make us the ſervants of Men. And indeed it is the moſt incoherent thing imaginable, for theſe who lay no claim to Infallibility, to pretend to abſolute obedience. It is true, the Laws of peace and order bind us to an aſſociation, if we be Chriſtians: and therefore we ought to yield in many things for peace: but ſince we are all a *Royal Prieſthood*, why Church-men ſhould pretend to Authority or Juriſdiction, except in that which is expreſly in their Commiſſion, wherein they are purely Heralds, I do not ſee. It is true, Chriſtians

ſtians ought to aſſemble for Worſhip, but for the aſſociations of Churches in Judicatories, I cannot imagine in what corner of the *New Teſtament* that ſhall be found: In which I am the more confirmed, ſince all the labor of that Pamphleteer from *p.* 126. *to* 144. could not find it out. For it is a ſtrange Method to prove a divine Warrant, becauſe ſome reaſons are brought to prove it muſt be ſo: to have cited the words, where a ſhorter and clearer method of proof; ſince to prove that ſuch a thing muſt be, and yet not to ſhew that it is, is only to attempt againſt the Scripture, for being defective in that which it ought to have contained. But if the phraſe of *one body* conclude a proof for Aſſociations, then ſince the Body includes all Chriſtians, the whole faithful muſt meet together in Councils. For where have you a difference in that betwixt the Clergy, and the faithful Laicks? But here yielding your Laick Elders of divine Inſtitution, and to have from *GOD* an Authority of Ruling, as well as the Miniſters have, then why do they not all come to Presbyteries? And why but one deputed from them? Was not this an Encroachment on them? For if they have from CHRIST a power to Rule, as well as Miniſters, why ſhould not all the Elders meet in Presbyteries and Synods, as well as Miniſters? And why but one Elder from every Preſ-

Presbytery, when three Miniſters go to the National Synod? For it is folly to ſay, becauſe Miniſters have a power of teaching, therefore in Presbyteries and Synods the Elders muſt only equal their number, and in National Synods be near half their number: for that will only ſay that in matters of doctrine the Elders ſhould be quite ſilent, but in matters of diſcipline, why all ſhould not come if any have a right from Chriſt, will not be proved. And is not this to *Lord it over your Brethren?* And do not your Miniſters thus tyrannize over their Elders? But the reaſon of it was viſible, leſt the Elders had thereby got the power in their hands, had they been the plurality in the Judicatories: which was well enough foreſeen and guarded againſt by your Clergy, who though they were willing to ſerve themſelves of them for a while, yet had no mind to part with their beloved Authority. But for Synods, if the obligation to them be from the unity of the Body, then nothing under an OEcumenical one will anſwer this, which yet is ſimply unpracticable. Now as for your National Synods, it is viſible they are and muſt be framed, according to the diviſions of the World in the ſeveral Kingdoms: for according to the Rules are pretended from Scripture (*tell the Church, the binding and looſing of ſins*, or the like) it follows that Parochial Congregations, and the Paſtors in

in them, are veſted with an authoritative power: now why they ſhould be made to reſign this to the plurality of the Church-men of that Kingdom, will be a great Atchievement to prove in your Principles. For why ſhall not a Parochial Church make Laws within it ſelf? And why muſt it renounce its priviledg to ſuch a number of Church-men caſt in ſuch a Claſſis by a humane power? As likewiſe, where find you a divine Warrant for your delegating Commiſſioners to Synods? For either they are Plenipotentiaries, or ſuch as go upon a reſtricted deputation, but ſo as their Votes beyond their Commiſſion ſhall ſignifie nothing, till they return and be approved by thoſe who ſent them; if they go with a full power, aſſign a Warrant for ſuch a delegation, or that many Church-men may commiſſionate one in their name, and that what ſhall be agreed to by the major part of theſe delegates, ſhall be a binding obligation on Chriſtians: and yet I know you will think the *Independents* carry the Cauſe, if it be ſaid that the appointments of theſe ſuperiour Courts have no authority till ratified by the inferiour, which will reſolve the Power into the inferiour Courts. By all which I think it is clear abundantly, that the aſſociations of Churches into Synods, cannot be by a divine Warrant. But I muſt call in ſome relief, for I grow weary of ſpeaking too long.

End.

Eud. I ſuppoſe none will deny the aſſociation of Churches to be an excellent mean for preſerving unity and peace: but to aſſert a divine original for them, methinks, is a hard task; and truly to aſſert the divine Authority of the major part which muſt be done according to the principles of Presbytery, is a thing fuller of Tyranny over Conſciences, than any thing can be feared from Epiſcopacy; ſince the greater part of mankind being evil, which holds true of no ſort of people more, than of Church-men, what miſchief may be expected if the plurality muſt decide all matters; And to ſpeak plainly, I look on a potion of Phyſick as the beſt cure for him, who can think a National Synod, according to the model of *Glaſgow*, is the Kingdom of *Chriſt* on Earth, or that Court to which he hath committed his Authority, for he ſeems beyond the power or conviction of Reaſon.

Crit. The Scripture clearly holds forth an authority among Church-men, but viſibly reſtricted to their Commiſſion, which truly is not properly a power reſiding among them, for they only declare what the Rule of the Goſpel is; wherein if they keep cloſe to it, they are only Publiſhers of the Laws of *CHRIST*: and if they err from it, they are not to be regarded: It is true, the adminiſtration of Sacraments is appropriated to them, yet he that will argue

this to have proceeded more from the general rules of Order, the constant practice of the Church, and the fitness of the thing, which is truly suitable to the dictates of Nature, and the Laws of Nations; than from an express positive Command, needs much Logick to make good his attempt. It is true, the ordaining of Successors in their Office belongs undoubtedly to them, and in trying them, Rules are expresly given out in Scripture, to which they ought to adhere and follow them: but as for other things, they are either decisions of opinions, or rules for practice. In the former their authority is purely to declare, and in that they act but as Men, and we find whole Schools of them have been abused; and in the other, they only give advices and directions, but have no Jurisdiction. It is true, much noise is made about the Council of *Jerusalem*, *p.* 106, as if that were a warrant for Synods to meet together. But first, it is clear no command is there given, so at most that will prove Synods to be lawful, but that gives them no authority, except you produce a clear Command for them, and obedience to them. Next, what strange wresting of Scripture is it, from that place to prove the subordination of Church Judicatories? for if that Council was not an OEcumenical Council, nor a Provincial one, which must be yielded, since we see nothing

nothing like a Convocation; then either *Paul* and *Barnabas* were ſent from *Antioch*, as from one ſiſter Church to ask advice of another; and if ſo, it proves nothing for the authority of Synods, ſince advices are not Laws: or *Antioch* ſent to *Jeruſalem*, as to a Superior Church by its conſtitution, which cannot be imagined: for what authority could the Church of *Jeruſalem* pretend over *Antioch*? And indeed had that been true, ſome veſtige of it had remained in Hiſtory; which is ſo far to the contrary, that the Church of *Jeruſalem* was ſubordinate to the Church of *Ceſarea*, which was Metropolitan in *Paleſtine*, was ſubject to *Antioch*, the third Patriarchal Sea. It will therefore remain that this was only a reference to the other Apoſtles, who beſides their extraordinary endowments and inſpiration, were acknowledged by all to be men of great eminency and authority: and therefore the authority of *Paul* and *Barnabas* not being at that time ſo univerſally acknowledged, they were ſent to *Jeruſalem*, where S. *James* was reſident, and S. *Peter* occaſionally preſent. Now the Authority of the Decree muſt be drawn from their infallible ſpirit; otherwiſe it will prove too much, that one Church may give out decrees to another. But will the Apoſtles mutual conſulting or conferring together, prove the National conſtitution, and authority of Synods or Aſſemblies?

Poly. All that hath been ſaid illuſtrates clearly the practice of the *Jews*, among whom as the High-Prieſt was poſſeſſed with a Prophetical Spirit, which ſometimes fell on him by illapſes, as apears from what is ſaid of *Caiaphas*; and ſometimes from the ſhining of the Stones in the Pectoral, called the *Urim* and *Thummim*; ſo the *Prieſts and Levites* being the chief Truſtees and Depoſitaries of the Law, *Their lips were to preſerve knowledg, and the Law was to be ſought at their mouth*, yet they had no Legiſlative Authority: they had indeed a Court among themſelves, called the *Parhedrim*, made up of the heads of the Orders, and of the Families; but that Court did not pretend to Juriſdiction, but only to explain things that concerned the Temple-worſhip: nay, the High-Prieſt was ſo reſtricted to the *King and Sanhedrim*, that he might not conſult the Oracle without he had been ordered to do it by them: neither do we ever hear of any Laws given out, all the *Old Teſtament* over, in the name of the Prieſts. And in the *New Teſtament*, the Power (it ſeems) was to be managed by the body of the faithful, as well as by Church-men. It is true, the Apoſtles were clothed with an extraordinary power of *binding and looſing of ſins*; but no proofs are brought to juſtifie the pretences to Juriſdiction that are found among their Succeſſors. For in the *Epiſtle*

to

to *Corinth*, the Rules there laid down, are addreſſed to *all the Saints that were called to be faithful*: ſo alſo is the *Epiſtle* to the *Theſſalonians*, where he tells them to *note ſuch as walked diſorderly, and have no fellowſhip with them*; which are ſhrewd grounds to believe that at firſt all things were managed Parochially, where the faithful were alſo admitted to determine about what occurred: but for Synods, we find not the leaſt veſtige of them before the end of the ſecond Century, that Synods were gathered about the Controverſie concerning the day of *Eaſter*; and the following Aſſociations of Churches, ſhew clearly, that they took their model from the diviſion of the *Roman Empire*, and ſo according as the Provinces were divided, the Churches in them did aſſociate to the Metropolitans, and became ſubordinate to them, and theſe were ſubordinate to the Patriarchs; by which means it was that the Biſhops of *Rome* had the precedency, not from any imaginary derivation from *St. Peter*: for had they gone on ſuch Rules, *Jeruſalem* where our Lord himſelf was, had undoubtedly carried it of all the World: but *Rome* being the *Imperial City*, it was the See of the greateſt Authority. And no ſooner did *Bizantium* creep into the dignity of being the *Imperial City*, but the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* was made ſecond Patriarch, and in all things equal to the Biſhop of

Rome, the precedency only excepted. Much might be here ſaid for proving that theſe Synods did not pretend to a divine Original, though afterwards they claimed a high Authority, yet their appointments were never called Laws, but only Canons and Rules, which could not pretend to a Juriſdiction.

Baſil. But that I may not ſeem to rob the Church of all her Power, I acknowledg that by the Laws of Nature it follows, that theſe who unite in the ſervice of *GOD*, muſt be warranted to aſſociate in Meetings to agree on generals Rules, and to uſe means for preſerving purity and order among themſelves, and that all Inferiours ought to ſubject themſelves to their Rules. But as for that brave diſtinction of the Churches Authority, being derived from CHRIST as Mediator, whereas the Regal Authority is from him as *GOD*, well doth it become its inventors, and much good may it do them. For me, I think, that CHRIST's aſſerting, that *all power in heaven and in earth was given unto him*; and his being called, *The KING of Kings, and LORD of Lords*, make it as clear as the Sun, that the whole OEconomy of this World is committed to him as Mediator: and as they who died before him, were ſaved by him, who was *ſlain from the foundation of the world*: ſo all humane authority was given by vertue of the ſecond Covenant,

Covenant, by which mankind was preſerved from infallible ruin, which otherwiſe it had incurred by *Adams* fall. But leaving any further enquiry after ſuch a fooliſh nicety, I go now to examine what the *Magiſtrates Power* is in matters of Religion: And firſt, I lay down for a Maxim, *That the externals of Worſhip, or Government, are not of ſuch importance, as are the Rules of Juſtice and Peace, wherein formally the Image of GOD conſiſts.* For CHRIST came to bring us to *GOD:* and the great end of his Goſpel, is, the aſſimilation of us to *GOD*, of which, juſtice, righteouſneſs, mercy and peace make a great part. Now what ſacredneſs ſhall be in the outwards of Worſhip and Government, that theſe muſt not be medled with by his hands; and what unhallowedneſs is in the other, that they may fall within his Juriſdiction, my weakneſs cannot reach. As for inſtance, when the Magiſtrate allows *ten per cent* of intereſt, it is juſt to exact it; and when he brings it down to *ſix per cent*, it is oppreſſion to demand *ten per cent*; ſo that he can determine ſome matters to be juſt or unjuſt by his Laws: now why he ſhall not have ſuch a power about outward matters of Worſhip, or of the Government of the Church, judg you; ſince the one both in it ſelf, and as it tends to commend us to God, is much more important than the other. It is

true, he cannot meddle with the holy things himſelf; for the Scripture rule is expreſs, that men be *ſeparated for the work of the Miniſtery*: And without that ſeparation, he invades the Altar of *GOD*, that *taketh that honor upon him, without he be called to it*. But as for giving Laws in the externals of *Religion*, I ſee not why he may not do it, as well as in matters *Civil*. It is true, if he contradict the divine Law by his commands, *GOD is to be obeyed rather than man*. But this holds in *things Civil*, as well as *Sacred*. For if he command murder, or theft, he is undoubtedly to be diſobeyed, as well as when he commands amiſs in matters of *Religion*. In a word, all Subjects are bound to obey him in every lawful command. Except therefore you prove that Church-men conſtituted in a Synod are not Subjects, they are bound to obedience, as well as others: Neither doth this Authority of the Magiſtrate any way prejudge the power *Chriſt* hath committed to his Church: For a Father hath power over his Children, and that by a *divine Precept*, tho the Supreme Authority have power over him, and them both: ſo the Churches authority is no way inconſiſtent with the Kings Supremacy. As for their *Declarative Power*, it is not at all ſubject to him, only the exerciſe of it, to this or that perſon, may be ſuſpended: For ſince the Magiſtrate can baniſh

his

his Subjects, he may well ſilence them: Yet I acknowledg if he do this, out of a deſign to drive the Goſpel out of his Dominions, they ought to continue in their duty, notwithſtanding ſuch prohibition; *for GOD muſt be obeyed rather than man.* And this was the caſe of the *Primitive Biſhops*, who rather than give over the feeding their Flocks, laid themſelves open to Martyrdom. But this will not hold for warranting turbulent perſons, who notwithſtanding the Magiſtrates continuing all encouragements for the publick Worſhip of *GOD*, chuſe rather than concur in it (tho not one of an hundred of them hath the confidence to call that unlawful) to gather ſeparated Congregations, whereby the flocks are ſcattered.

Phil. Nay, ſince you are on that Subject, let me freely lay open the miſchief of it: It is a direct breach of the Laws of the Goſpel, that requires our ſolemn aſſembling together, which muſt ever bind all Chriſtians, till there be ſomewhat in the very conſtitutions of theſe Aſſemblies, that renders our meeting in them unlawful: which few pretend in our caſe. Next, the Magiſtrates commanding theſe publick Aſſemblies, is certainly a clear and ſuperadded obligation, which muſt bind all under ſin, till they can prove theſe our Meetings for Worſhip unlawful. And as theſe ſeparated Conventicles

are

are of their own nature evil, ſo their effects are yet worſe, and ſuch as indeed all the ignorance and profanity in the Land is to be charged on them: for as they diſſolve the union of the Church, which muſt needs draw miſchief after it, ſo the vulgar are taught to deſpiſe their Miniſters, and the publick Worſhip, and thus get looſe from the yoak. And their dependence on theſe ſeparated Meetings, being but precarious, as they break away from the order of the Church, ſo they are not tied to their own order: and thus betwixt hands, the vulgar loſe all ſenſe of Piety, and of the Worſhip of *GOD*. Next, in theſe ſeparated Meetings, nothing is to be had but a long preachment, ſo that the knowledg and manners of the people not being look'd after, and they taught to revolt from the ſetled *Diſcipline*, and to diſdain to be catechiſed by their Paſtors, *ignorance and profanity* muſt be the ſure effect of theſe divided Meetings. And in fine, the diſuſe of the *LORD's Supper* is a guilt of a high nature; for the vulgar are taught to loath the Sacrament from their Miniſters hands, as much as the Maſs: and preaching is all they get in their Meetings: ſo that what in all Ages of the Church hath been looked on, as the great cheriſhing of Devotion and true Piety and the chief preſerver of Peace among Chriſtians, is wearing out of practice with our new

new modelled Christians. These are the visible effects of separating practices: But I shall not play the uncharitable Diviner, to guess at the secret mischief such courses may be guilty of.

Basil. Truly, what you have laid out is so well known to us all, that I am confident *Isotimus* himself must with much sorrow acknowledg what wicked Arts these are that some use to dislocate the Body of Christ, and to sacrifice the interests of *Religion* to their vanity, humor, or perhaps their secular interests. But I hold on my design, and add, that if the Magistrate encroach on God's Prerogative, by *contradicting or abrogating divine Laws*, all he doth that way, falls on himself. But as for the Churches *Directive Power*, since the exercise of that is not of obligation, he may command a surcease in it. It is true, he may sin in so doing; yet cases may be wherein he will do right to discharge all Associations of Judicatories, if a Church be in such commotion, that these Synods would but add to the flame: but certainly he forbidding such Synods, they are not to be gone about, there being no positive command for them in Scripture, and therefore a discharge of them contradicts no Law of *God*, and so cannot be disobeyed without sin: and when the Magistrate allows of Synods, he is to judg on whether side

in

in case of differences, he will pass his Law: neither is the decision of these Synods obligatory in prejudice of his authority; for there can be but one Supream; and two Coordinate Powers are a *Chymæra.* Therefore in case a Synod and the Magistrate contradict one another in matters undetermined by *GOD*, it is certain a Synod sins if it offer to countermand the *Civil Authority*, since all must be subject to the Powers that are, of which number the Synod is a part; therefore they are subject as well as others. And if they be bound to obey the Magistrates commands, they cannot have a power to warrant the subjects in their disobedience, since they cannot secure themselves from sin by such disobedience. And in the case of such countermands, it is indisputable the Subjects are to be determined by the Magistrates Laws, by which only the Rules of Synods are Laws, or bind the consciences formally; since without they be authorized by him, they cannot be Laws; for we cannot serve two Masters, nor be subject to two Legislators. And thus, methinks, enough is said for clearing the Title of the *Magistrate in exacting our obedience to his Laws in matters of Religion.*

Crit. Indeed, the congesting of all the *Old Testament* offers, for proving the Civil Powers their authority in things sacred, were a task of time:

time: And first of all, that the High Priest might not consult the Oracle, but when either desired by the King, or in a business that concerned the whole Congregation, is a great step to prove what the Civil Authority was in those matters. Next, we find the Kings of *Judah* give out many Laws about matters of Religion: I shall wave the instances of *David* and *Solomon*, which are so express, that no evasion can serve the turn, but to say they acted by immediate Commission, and were inspired of GOD. It is indeed true, that they had a particular direction from GOD. But it is as clear, that they enacted these Laws upon their own Authority, as Kings, and not on a Prophetical Power.

But we find *Jehoshaphat*, 2 *Chr.* 17. *v.* 7. sending to his Princes to teach in the Cities of *Judah*, with whom also he sent *Priests* and *Levites*, and they went about and taught the people. There you see secular men appointed by the King to teach the people: he also, 2. *Chr.* 19. *v.* 5. set up in *Jerusalem* a Court made up of *Levites, Priests, and the chief of the Fathers of Israel, for the judgment of the* LORD, *and for the controversies among the people*; and names two Presidents, *Amariah the chief Priest to be over them in the matters of the* LORD, *and Zebadiah for all the Kings matters.* And he that will

will consider these words, either as they lie in themselves, or as they relate to the first institution of that Court of seventy by *Moses*, where no mention is made but by one Judicatory, or to the Commentary of the whole Writings, and Histories of the *Jews*; shall be set beyond dispute, that here was but one Court to judg both of sacred and secular matters. It is true, the *Priests* had a Court already mentioned, but it was no Judicatory, and medled only with the Rituals of the Temple. The *Levites* had also, as the other Tribes, a Court of twenty three for their Tribe, which have occasioned the mistakes of some places among the *Jewish* Writings: but this is so clear from their Writings, that a very overly knowledg of them will satisfie an impartial Observer. And it is yet more certain, that from the time of *Ezra*, to the destruction of the Temple, there was but one Court, that determined of all matters both Sacred and Civil; who particularly tried the Priests, if free of the blemishes which might cast one from the service, and could cognosce on the High Priest, and whip him when he failed in his duty. Now this commixtion of these matters in one Judicatory, if it had been so criminal, whence is it that our *LORD* not only never reproved so great a disorder, but when convened before them, did not accuse

cuſe their conſtitution, and anſwered to the High Prieſt when adjured by him? Likewiſe, when his Apoſtles were arraigned before them, they never declined that Judicatory, but pleaded their own innocence, without accuſing the conſtitution of the Court, though challenged upon a matter of doctrine. But they, *good men*, thought only of catching Souls into the Net of the Goſpel, and were utterly unacquainted with theſe new coined diſtinctions. Neither did they refuſe obedience, pretending the Court had no Juriſdiction in theſe matters, but becauſe it was better to obey *GOD* than Man; which ſaith, They judged Obedience to that Court due, if it had not countermanded *GOD*.

But to return to *Jehoſhaphat*, we find him conſtituting theſe Courts, and chooſing the perſons and empowering them for their work, *for he conſtituted them for Judgment and for Controverſie*; ſo that though it were yielded, as it will never be proved, that two Courts were here inſtituted, yet it cannot be denied, but here is a Church Judicatory conſtituted by a King, the perſons named by him, a Preſident appointed over them, and a truſt committed to them. And very little Logick will ſerve to draw from this, as much as the Acts among us, aſſerting the King's Supremacy yield to him.

Next,

Next, We have a clear inſtance of *Hezekiah*, who, 2 *Chron.*30. *ver.* 2. with the *Counſel of his Princes, and of the whole Congregation*, made a *decree for keeping the Paſſover*, that year *on the ſecond Month*, whereas the Law of *GOD* had affixed it to the *firſt Month*, leaving only an exception, *Numb.*9.10. *for the unclean*, or ſuch *as were on a journey*, to keep it on the ſecond Month. Npon which *Hezekiah* with the *Sanhedrim* and people, appoints the Paſſover to be entirely caſt over to the ſecond Month for that Year. Where a very great point of their Worſhip (for the diſtinction of days was no ſmall matter to the *Jews*) was determined by the King, without asking the advice of the Prieſts upon it. But that you may not think this was peculiar to the King of *Iſrael*, I ſhall urge you with other inſtances: When *Ezra* came from *Artaxerxes*, he brings a Commiſſion from him, *Ezra ch.*7. *ver.*25, 26. impowering him *according to the wiſdom of his GOD, that was in his hand, to ſet up Magiſtrates and Judges, who might judg them that knew the Laws of his GOD, and teach them that knew them not*: and a ſevere certificate is paſſed upon the diſobedient; and one of the branches of their puniſhment, which is by the Tranſlators rendered *baniſhment*, being in the *Chaldaick, rooting out*, is by ſome judged to be *Excommunication*; which is the more probable, be-

becauſe afterwards, *Chap.* 10. *ver.* 8. the Cenſure he threatens on theſe who came not upon his Proclamation, is, *forfeiture of goods, and ſeparation from the Congregation.* Here then it ſeems a Heathen King gives authority to Excommunicate: but be in that what will, *Ezra* upon his return acted in a *high Character*, he makes the *Prieſts*, *Levites*, and all *Iſrael*, to ſwear to put away their ſtrange Wives: he convenes all the people under the Certificate of ſeparation from the Congregation, and enjoyns Confeſſion of their ſins and amendment: and we find both him and *Nehemiah* acting in a *high Character* about the ordering of divine matters, which could only flow from the King's Commiſſion, for neither of them were Prophets, nor was *Ezra* the High Prieſt but his Brother, and ſo no more than an ordinary Prieſt. *Mordecai* likewiſe inſtituted the feaſt of *Purim*, for which nothing could warrant him, but the King's authority, committed to him, who gave him his Ring for ſealing ſuch Orders, ſince he was neither King, Prieſt nor Prophet. And on the way, let me obſerve what occurs from that Hiſtory, for proving what was yeſterday pleaded for, *The Subjects ought not to reſiſt, no not the tyranny of their Superiours*, ſince a Writing was procured from *Abaſuerus* for warranting the *Jews* to avenge themſelves, and to ſtand for their lives,

and to destroy and slay all that would assault them, which saith they might not have done this before that writing was given out, and yet their killing of 74000 of their Enemies shews, what their strength was. But all I have said will prove that the Civil Powers under the Old Testament did formally judg about matters of Religion; and that that priviledg belongs to Kings by vertue of their Regal dignity, and not as they are in Covenant with *GOD*, since even Heathen Kings give out Orders about divine matters.

Poly. If from Sacred you descend to humane practices, nothing was more used than that the Emperors judged in matters of Religion, neither was this yielded to them only after they became Christians, but *Eusebius, lib. 7. cap. 30.* tells, how they made application to *Aurelian* a Heathen Emperor, for turning *Samosatenus* out of the Church of *Antioch*, who decreed that the Houses of the Church should be given to those Bishops, whom the Christians of *Italy* and the *Roman* Bishops should recommend to them. *Constantine* also, when not baptized, did all his life formally judg in matters both of Doctrine and Discipline: and for the Laws they made about Church matters, they abound so much, that, as *Grotius* saith, *One needs not read them, but look on them to be satisfied about this.*

And

And indeed I know not how to expreſs my wonder at the affrontedneſs of that Pamphleter, who denies this, *pag.* 483. Pray ask him, was the determining about the age, the qualifications, the Election, the duties of Church-men, the declaring for what things they ſhould be depoſed, or excommunicated, a formal paſſing of Laws in Church matters, or only the adding Sanctions to the Church determinations? And yet who will but with his Eye run through either the firſt ſix *Titles* of the *Code*, or the 123. *Novel*, beſides many other places, all theſe, and many more Laws about Church matters will meet him. But ſhould I take a full Career here, I am ſure I ſhould be tedious, and *Grotius* hath congeſted ſo many inſtances of this, that I refer the curious Reader to him for full ſatisfaction. The Elections of Biſhops which had been formerly in the hands of the people and Clergy, with the Provincial Synods that judged of them, became ſo tumultuary, that popular Elections were diſcharged by the Council of *Laodicea*, *Can.* 13. and the Emperors did either formally name, as *Theodoſius* did *Nectarius*, or reſerve the ratifying their Election to themſelves. And I muſt confeſs, it is a pretty piece of Hiſtory, to ſay the Biſhops conſented to this, either as diffident of their Office, or out of ambition. *See p.* 485. Tell your Friends that they muſt either

learn more knowledg, or pretend to leſs; for can they produce the leaſt veſtige for the one branch of this alternative, that the Biſhops their allowing the Emperor ſuch an intereſt in their Elections, flowed from a diſtruſt of their Office? Let them give but one ſcrap of proof for this, and let them triumph as much as they will. Is it not a pretty thing to ſee one talk ſo ſuperciliouſly of things he knows not?

Iſot. But all you have brought will never prove that a King may at one ſtroke ſubvert a Government eſtabliſhed in the Church, and turn out all who adhere to it, and ſet up another in its place; neither will this conclude that the King may enact all things about Eccleſiaſtical matters, and Perſons, by his own bare authority, which is a ſurrender of our conſciences to him: certainly, this is to put him in *CHRIST*'s ſtead, and what miſchievous effects may follow upon this, if all matters of Religion be determined, by the pleaſure of ſecular and carnal men, who conſider their intereſts and appetites more than *God*'s glory, or the good of the Church and of Souls: Truly my heart trembles to think on the effects this both hath produced, and ſtill may bring forth. *See pag.* 483.

Phil. It is charity to eaſe your Lungs ſometimes by taking a turn in the Diſcourſe, though you need none of my help. But what you ſay,

Iſoti-

Isotimus, doth no way overturn what hath been aſſerted: for either the change that was made was neceſſary, ſinful, or indifferent: the two former ſhall not be at this time debated, but ſhall be afterwards diſcuſſed: but if it be indifferent, then the Kings Laws do oblige us to obedience, and the miſchief hath followed on the change falls to their ſhare, who do not obey the King's Laws, when the matter of them is lawful. And as for the thruſting out Church-men when they are guilty, *Solomon*'s precedent is convincing, who thruſt out *Abiathar* from the High Prieſthood; neither can the leaſt hint be given to prove that he acted as inſpired, and not as a King: and *Nehemiah* tho but commiſſionated by *Artaxerxes*, thruſt one out from the Prieſthood, for marrying a ſtrange Woman.

For your prying into Acts of Parliament, truly neither you nor I need be ſo much converſant in them. Neither were it any ſtrange matter, if ſome expreſſions in them would not bear a ſtrict Examen. But that you now challenge about the *King's enacting of all matters*, will never infer a ſurrender of conſcience to him; for certainly that muſt relate to what goeth before, of the *outward Government and Policy of the Church*. Beſides, none will quarrel the phraſe of the *Kings authority* in all things that are *Civil*; yet that will not infer that he can enact the lawfulneſs of

murther and theft. So these expressions must carry with them *a tacite exception.* Yea, even without that allowance, the phrase may be well justified, since it only imports that the Kings enacting any thing in these matters, makes them legal, which differs much from lawful; and saith only that such Orders issued forth by the King, are *de facto* Laws, which will not conclude they must be obeyed; but only that his authority is to be acknowledged, either by obedience, if the command be just, or by suffering, if unjust. As for the effects this may produce, I am sure they cannot prove worse than these which have followed upon the pretences of the Churches *absolute authority, and intrinsick Sovereign Power.* And indeed since there is so much corruption among men, nothing that falls into the hands of men, can scape the mixtures of abuse at long run. But I must add, that the passions and pride of many Church-men in all Ages have been such, that the decision of the plurality of Church-men, seems the model of the World that is fullest of danger.

Iſot. Three things yet remain to be discussed: The one is, if obedience be due to the Laws, when they command things contrary to our consciences? For sure you cannot pretend in that case, to give a preference to humane Laws beyond conscience, which is the voice of

GOD,

GOD. The next is, when the Magiſtrate commands things juſt of themſelves, but upon unjuſt motives and narratives, whether my obedience doth not homologate his bad deſigns? And finally, where the commands of the Magiſtrate are manifeſtly unlawful, how far ſhould the Church, and Church men, oppoſe and contradict them? For a bare non-obedience ſeems not to be all we are bound to, in that caſe. When I am ſatisfied in theſe things, I will quit this purpoſe.

Baſil. To engage in a particular diſcuſſion of what is now moved by you, would draw on more diſcourſe than our preſent leiſure will allow of; yet I ſhall attempt the ſaying of what may ſatisfie a clear and unprejudged mind. And to the firſt, I ſhall not fall on any longer enquiry into the nature and obligation of conſcience, than to tell that *conſcience is a conviction of our rational faculties, that ſuch or ſuch things are ſutable to the nature and Will of God.* Now all Religion is bound upon us, on this account, that there is ſuch evidence offered for its truth, which may and ought to ſatisfie the ſtricteſt Examen of Reaſon. And all certainty is reſolved in this, that our rational faculties are convinced of the truth of the objects that lie before us: which conviction when applied to divine matters, is called *Conſcience.* But there may be

great miſtakes in this Conviction: for either the prejudices that lie on our minds from our ſenſes, the prepoſſeſſions of Education, intereſt, or humors, the want of a due application of our faculties to their objects, or chiefly the dulneſs and leſion of our Organs, the corruption of our minds through ſin and luſt, occaſion many errors: ſo that often without good reaſon, oft contrary to it, we take up perſuaſions, to which we ſtifly adhere, and count ſuch convictions evidences of the Will of *GOD*. I acknowledg, when a Man lies under a perſuaſion of the Will of *GOD*, he ought not to go croſs to it: for this opens a door to Atheiſm, when that is contradicted of which we are convinced. But if this perſuaſion be falſe, it cannot ſecure a Man from ſinning in following of it. For it is a Man's own fault that he is thus impoſed upon, ſince if his rational faculties were duly applied, and well purified, they ſhould prove unerring touchſtones of truth. If therefore through vanity, wilfulneſs, raſhneſs, or any other byaſs of the mind, it be carried to wrong meaſures, a Man is to blame himſelf, and thus his errour ought to aggravate, and not leſſen his guilt. If then a Man's conſcience dictate to him the contrary of what *GOD* commands, in that caſe, he is in a viſible hazard: for his error can never take away *GOD*'s Authority, and ſo his wrong infor-

informed conſcience doth not ſecure him from guilt, if he be diſobedient. On the other hand, nothing in Scripture can bind a Man to act againſt the convictions of conſcience, ſince we are bound to believe the Scriptures, only becauſe of the evidence of their authority to our rational faculties: If then our belief of the Scriptures reſt on that foundation, no part of Scripture can bind us to walk contrary to that evidence, for then it ſhould deſtroy that Principle on which our Obligation to believe it ſelf is founded, which is the evidence of reaſon; and ſo in that caſe, a Man ſins whatever he do. Neither is this to be accounted ſtrange, ſince that *erroneous conſcience* is from man's own fault. And that which ſome alledg to eſcape this, that in ſuch caſes a Man ought to forbear from acting, will not ſerve turn, to excuſe a Man from ſin: For in theſe Precepts which exact a poſitive obedience, ſuch a forbearance and ſurceaſing from action, is a ſin.

Upon theſe Evidences then it will follow, that if the conviction of our conſcience run contrary to the Magiſtrates commands, theſe *convictions* are either well grounded, or ill: If the former, then the Magiſtrates command being contrary to the nature and Will of *GOD*, are not to be obeyed: If ill grounded, then that miſtaken perſuaſion cannot ſecure us from ſin,

no

no more than *in the case of conscience* contradicting the Law of *GOD:* for the Laws of the Magistrates in things lawful, are the Laws of *GOD*, being the application of his general Laws unto particular instances, by one cloathed with authority from him. Therefore tho I do not say the Laws of the Magistrate can warrant our counteracting an *erroneous conscience*; yet on the contrary, a *misinformed conscience* will not secure us when we disobey the Magistrates lawful commands. And thus I think your first Question is clearly answered.

End. You have a great deal of reason to say so, your discourse being so closely rational, that I cannot see any escape from any part of it; yet I must add, that certainly it is a piece of *Christian tenderness*, which obligeth all in Authority, to beware of laying gall-traps and snares in the way of *tender consciences*. And the best way to get an *undisputed obedience*, is, that their commands be liable to as few exceptions as is possible; and that the good of any such Laws be well ballanced with the hazards of them, that so the Communion of the Church in all outwards, particularly in the Sacraments, may be had on as easie terms as is possible, whereby nothing be enacted that may frighten away weaker minds from *the fellowship of the Saints*. But on the other hand, great caution must be had by all Subjects

on

on what grounds they refuſe *obedience to the Laws*, that ſo they be not found following their own deſigns and intereſts, under a colour of adhering firmly to *their conſciences*. They muſt deliver themſelves from all prepoſſeſſions, and narrowly examine all things, ere they adventure on refuſing *obedience to the Laws*. But now conſider if an unjuſt motive or narrative in a Law, deliver *tender conſciences* from an obligation to obey it, or not?

Baſil. If the Magiſtrate do couple his motive and narrative with our obedience, ſo that we cannot do the one without a ſeeming conſent to the other, then certainly we are not to obey: For actions being often ſigns of the thoughts, an action how indifferent ſoever, if declared a ſign of concurring in a ſinful deſign, makes us guilty, in ſo far as we expreſs our concurrence by a ſign enjoyned for that end. But if the motive or narrative be ſimply an account of the Magiſtrates own thoughts, without expreſſing that *obedience* is to be underſtood as a *concurrence* in ſuch intentions, then we are to obey a lawful command, tho enacted upon a bad deſign: For we muſt obey theſe in Authority, ever till they ſtand in competition with *GOD*. If then their Laws contradict not *GOD*'s Precepts, neither in their natural nor intended ſignification, they are to be obeyed, whatever the grounds

grounds were for enacting them, which is only the Magiſtrates deed, for which he ſhall anſwer to *GOD*.

Poly. This calls me to mind of two Stories not impertinent to this purpoſe: The one is of *Julian the Apoſtate*, who to entangle the Chriſtians, that never ſcrupled the bowing to the Emperors Statue, as a thing lawful, cauſed to ſet up his with the Images of ſome of the Gods about it, that ſuch as bowed to it, might be underſtood, as (likewiſe) bowing to the Images: which abuſed ſome of the ſimpler: but the more diſcerning refuſed to bow at all to thoſe Statues, becauſe he intended to expound that innocent bowing to his Statue, as an adoration of the Gods about it. A Chriſtian likewiſe being brought to the King of *Perſia*, did according to the Law bow before him; but when he underſtood that to be exacted as a divine Honor to the King, he refuſed it.

Eud. This is clear enough that all actions are as they are underſtood, and accordingly to be performed, or ſurceaſed from. But it ſeems more difficult to determine what is to be done in caſe a Magiſtrate enact wicked Laws: Are not both his Subjects bound to refuſe obedience; and the Heads of the Church, and the watchmen of Souls likewiſe to witneſs againſt it? And may they not declare openly their diſlike of ſuch

Laws

Laws or practices, and proceed againſt him with the cenſures of the Church? ſince as to the Cenſures of the Church, we ſee no reaſon why they ſhould be diſpenſed with *reſpect of perſons*, which S. *James* condemns in all Church Judicatories.

Baſil. I ſhall not need to repeat what hath been ſo often ſaid, that *we muſt obey GOD rather than man:* if then the Magiſtrates enjoyn what is directly contrary to the *divine Law*, all are to refuſe obedience, and watchmen ought to warn their Flocks againſt ſuch hazards; and ſuch as can have admittance to their Princes, or who have the charge of their Conſciences, ought with a great deal of ſincere freedom, as well as humble duty, repreſent the evil and ſinfulneſs of ſuch Laws: but for any *Synodical Convention*, or any Declaration againſt them, no warrant for that doth appear; and therefore if the Magiſtrate ſhall ſimply diſcharge all Synods, I cannot ſee how they can meet without ſin. But for Parochial meetings of Chriſtians for a ſolemn acknowledgment of *GOD*, ſuch Aſſemblings for divine Worſhip, being enjoined both by the Laws of Nature, and Nations, and particularly commanded in the Goſpel, no conſideration can free Chriſtians from their Obligation, thus to aſſemble for Worſhip: if then the Magiſtrate ſhould diſcharge theſe or any part of them, ſuch as Prayer, Praiſes, and reading of Scrip-

Scriptures, preaching the Goſpel, or the uſe of the Sacraments, they are notwithſtanding all that to be continued in. But for the conſultative or directive Government of the Church, till a divine Command be produced for Synods or Diſcipline, it cannot lawfully be gone about without or againſt his authority.

Crit. For refuſing obedience to an unjuſt command, of ſurceaſing viſible Worſhip, the inſtance of *Daniel* is ſignal: who not only continued his adorations to *GOD*, for all *Darius* his Law; but did it openly, and avowedly, that ſo he might own his ſubjection to *GOD*. But for reproving Kings, we ſee what caution was to be obſerved in it; ſince *GOD* ſent Prophets with expreſs Commiſſions for it in the Old Teſtament: and *Samuel* notwithſtanding this ſevere meſſage to *Saul*, *yet honored him before his people*. It is true, there ſhould be no reſpect of perſons in Chriſtian Judicatories: but that is only to be underſtood of theſe who are ſubject to them: and how it can agree to the King who is Supream, to be a Subject, is not eaſily to be comprehended. Since then honor and obedience is by divine precept due to Magiſtrates, nothing that invades that honor, or detracts from that obedience, can be lawfully attempted againſt them: ſuch as is any Church-cenſure or excommunication. And therefore I can-

cannot ſee how that practice of *Ambroſe* upon *Theodoſius*, or other later inſtances of ſome Biſhops of *Rome*, can be reconciled to that, *Render fear to whom fear, and honor to whom honor is due.*

Phil. I am ſure their practice is far leſs juſtifiable, who are always preaching about the Laws and times to the people, with virulent reflections on King, Parliament and Council: much more ſuch as not content with flying diſcourſes, do by their writings, which they hope ſhall be longer lived, ſtudy the vilifying the perſons, and affronting the authority of theſe *GOD* hath ſet over them. And how much of this ſtuff the Preſs hath vented theſe thirty years by paſt, ſuch as knew the late times, or ſee their writings, can beſt judge.

Eud. Now our diſcourſe having dwelt ſo long upon generals, is to deſcend to particulars: That we may examine whether upon the grounds hitherto laid down, the late tumults, or the preſent Schiſms and diviſions can be juſtified, or ought to be cenſured? I know this is a nice point, and it is to be tenderly handled, leſt all that ſhall be ſaid be imputed to the ſuggeſtions of paſſions and malice. Wherefore let me intreat you who are to bear the greater part of that diſcourſe, to proceed in it calmly, that it may appear your deſigns are not to lodge infamy on any party or perſon, but ſimply to lay

lay out things as they are: hoping withal, that you will not take your informations of what you ſay from the tatles of perſons concerned, but will proceed on true and ſure grounds. And that we may return to this with the greater compoſedneſs of ſpirit; let our ſerious thoughts be interrupted with ſome chearfuller diverſions: for our ſpirits are now too far engaged to fall upon ſuch a Head.

Iſot. You have a great deal of reaſon to guard your Friends well when they are to fall upon ſuch matters, leſt they ſin againſt the generation of *GOD*'s Children. For my part, I am not afraid to enter on a diſcuſſion of theſe things, and doubt not to make it appear how the *LORD*'s work was ſignally carried on by his faithful Servants, and that he himſelf appeared in it, even to the conviction of all beholders. If there were any either of the Church or State, who covered their own bad deſigns, under theſe pretences, that makes not the cauſe a whit the worſe: for CHRIST *choſe twelve, and one of them had a Devil.*

Phil. Were I at preſent to fall a canvaſing theſe things, I doubt not I ſhould quickly make all your Plumes fall off: but I am willing at this time to break off our Conference: for this point will neither be ſoon diſpatched nor eaſily mananaged; therefore we ſhall now part with an appoint-

pointment to meet next day in this ſame place after Dinner.

Baſil. I believe none of us are ſo weary of another, or of the Diſcourſes we have toſſed theſe two days, that it is needful to apprehend any will fail of being here at that hour: therefore, good night to you all.

Iſot. Be ſure, I ſhall keep it, if an unavoidable excuſe detain me not. Adieu.

Crit. For me and *Polybiſtor*, though it is like we ſhall not have great occaſion of bearing our ſhare in your Diſcourſe, yet we will not fail to be here.

Eud. I cannot expreſs my ſenſe of the Honour you do me, in making this place ſtill happy with ſo many good Company, and ſo much pleaſant Diſcourſe: and therefore you may aſſure your ſelves, I will wait for your return, not without impatience. And ſo I bid you all, good night.

THE THIRD CONFERENCE.

Iſotimus.

WE are again as good as our word in keeping this appointment, and I hope we ſhall be no leſs exact in obſerving the Rule we concluded laſt night of tempering our paſſions; only I muſt guard you againſt the miſtaking my zeal I may expreſs for paſſion: remember who ſaid, *The zeal of thy houſe hath eaten me up, who alſo ſcourged the buyers and ſellers out of the Temple.*

Eud. I confeſs, I want not my fears of ſome heat and exceſs in this days Diſcourſe: but I will crave leave to check it on what ſide ſoever it appear, I know there is a holy zeal for *GOD*, which will inflame a devout mind. But its fire is mild and gentle, free of bluſtering and diſorder: and that rage which is in many, for ſome Parties or Opinions, and againſt others, being

as

as void of knowledg as of Charity, ought not to pretend to Christ's Example, unleſs they be likewiſe acted by his Spirit. A diligent ſearch will quickly diſcover, if our motives and maxims have a tincture of his lowly meek and ſelf-denying ſpirit in them. And certainly if our zeal be for *GOD*, it will take its degrees from the proportion of its Objects. It is therefore a *Phariſaical* pretence to own a zeal for ſome ſmaller matters, which have ſcarce been thought upon by the whole ſeries of Chriſtians in all Ages, till of late, when we are ſo cold in the defence of Peace, Charity, obedience to thoſe over us, and the Unity of the Church: which are great, certain, and indiſpenſible Duties. That zeal likewiſe which tranſports a man unto unjuſtifiable heats of railing againſt particular perſons, and appears in a bitter humor of dull jeering, and bold detraction, hath no reaſon to ſhroud it ſelf under the Example of *CHRIST*'s holy zeal; who tho in the ſpirit of a Zealot, having proved his divine Miſſion and authority by Miracles, he whipped the defilers of the Temple out of it; yet that diſpenſation wherein ſuch practices were not unuſual from extraordinary perſons, being now changed into the new one, whoſe diſtinguiſhing Character is *Charity*, we are to bridle all the motions of diſtempered heat, leſt the effects

of it be as unjuſtifiable as it ſelf is. For it is to be conſidered, that the proper characters of the Goſpel Spirit, are not devotion towards *GOD*, or zeal for his truths, which were common both with the Religon traditionally conveyed from *Adam*, and *Noah*, and that which was delivered to *Moſes*; but that which *CHRIST* hath made the cogniſance of his Diſciples, is, *That they love one another*, whereby all muſt know them to be ſuch. And therefore all theſe who diſcover a ſpirit of hatred, rage, and malice at theſe, of whom they cannot deny but they may be *Chriſt*'s Diſciples, prove themſelves to be void of his Spirit. Now, *Iſotimus*, what endleſs complaints could I here make of ſome you know of, who are perpetually trafficking to make all who differ from them odious, who catch up every Tattle they hear that may defame them, and are ſure to ſpread it as far as either their Tongue or Pen can reach: nor are they Niggards of their additions to them, to make them ſwell bigger. With what marvellous joy do they ſuck in an ill report? and tho it be but dubiouſly related, they will be ſure to vent it as the greateſt truth in the World. And when the ſtock of Reports fails them, then they break in upon their Magazins of Forgeries: and here is an endleſs Trade. Sometimes they will piece up things as incoherent as the Rags

of

of a Beggars Cloak, and ſhew either their pretended *intelligence*, or profound *ſagacity*, to ſmell out bad *intentions*. If they can fix nothing on their *Adverſary*, then that he is an *Hypocrite*, or a *Diſſembler*, comes well to ſerve all purpoſes, and to defeat the beſt *intentions*: And, oh! but the jealouſies of Popery and Jeſuitical practices, work wonders on their Belief! Indeed, *Sir*, I muſt tell you freely, I ſee a Spirit ſtirring among us, which I look upon as tinctured with the deepeſt dye of *Antichriſtianiſm*, and ſo void of the common impreſſions of good nature and civility; but much more of his Image, who will have us *learn of him, in that he is meek and lowly*, that really a Man had as well live among *Scythians* and *Barbarians*, as among ſuch Waſps and Vipers. Every thing is alike for their malice. Do ſome that differ from them live in a franker way, theſe are ſure to be called *licentious and profane*. Are others more ſevere, ſilent, and retired, who expreſs a contempt of the world with all its enjoyments, theſe muſt paſs for Papiſts, Juglers and Hypocrites; and their beſt actions muſt be laſhed with the worſt Cenſures. Again, if we treat them ſoftly with gentleneſs and reſpect, then they are inſolent, and impute ſuch uſage to our diſtruſt of our own Opinions, and a forced value of their way. And if we uſe a little more free-

dom to ſpeak home, and diſcover their weakneſs and perverſneſs to them, then they rage and ſome, and call us *Blaſphemers*; and apply all the threatnings againſt mockers of *GOD* and Piety, to ſuch as ſhall offer to unmask them, or diſcloſe any of their follies. If theſe in Authority coerce them, nothing is to be heard but complaints of *perſecution, and revilings, and evil ſurmiſings*: But will gentle courſes mollifie their hearts? No, not ſo much as to be grateful or civil to thoſe to whom they ow them: but they will be ſure to obſerve how *GOD* binds up the hands of the wicked, and how marvellouſly he protects his own: and all the favor ſhewed them will have no better character than a *very mean and ſcant act of Juſtice, elicite by a viſible State convenience, if not neceſſity. See p.*493. You know of whom I mean, and how juſtly applicable theſe Characters are to them: and that they are not the dreams of an *extravagant fancy*; but true, though imperfect deſcriptions of what every one ſees to be among us.

Iſot. I am heartily ſorry to find you the firſt that ſwerves from your own Rule, and to hear you engage in a Diſcourſe ſo unlike your ſelf, at leaſt ſo different from the character is conceived of you: theſe invectives being fitter for the *Author of the friendly Debate, the Scribler of the Dialogues, or the Aſſerter of Eccleſiaſtical Policy*, who

have

have mortally wounded *Religion*, and all the profeſſions and expreſſions of it, under a pretence of unvailing the *Phariſaical ſpirit*. And indeed you are now in the ſame Tract, your deſign being to charge all the faithful ſervants of *CHRIST*, with this tatling, whiſpering, and cenſorious temper; becauſe perhaps ſome idle people who own a kindneſs for theſe Opinions, but really are of no principles, may be guilty of theſe ways.

Eud. I beſeech you, wreſt not my words beyond my deſign, and their meaning. I charge not the whole Party with theſe Arts: yet that there is too great compliance given to them, and too little freedom uſed againſt them, by too many, may without unjuſtice, or breach of Charity, be averred: but the diſcloſing of theſe is ſo far from *injuring Religion*, that I know nothing ſo proper for recovering the World from the jealouſies theſe Arts have occationed at it, as the unmasking of that Spirit; that ſo the amiable and lovely viſage of *true Religion* may appear in its own luſtre, and free of theſe falſe Colors ſome unjuſt pretenders to it, have caſt over it: and therefore theſe Writings you mention, ſeem to have purſued a noble Deſign, which ſhall not want its reward. But remember I make a vaſt difference betwixt the being of an Opinion, and the purſuing all theſe crooked and wicked

practices for its defence, which I have laid before you. At the former, I have no quarrel: for knowing how ſubject my ſelf is to miſtakes, I cenſure and judg none for their Opinions, till they ſtrike at the *foundations of Faith*, or a *good life*: And ſo do not only not charge all your Party with theſe imputations, but know a great many of them who are very free of them: but that many are too guilty of them, is what your ſelf dares not deny. And how much of that temper appears in the late Pamphlets, I leave with every rational *Reader* to conſider: for it is not worth the while for any of us to ſit down, and canvaſs them all. But how guilty are moſt of you in this which you here blame me unjuſtly for, which is the charging a Party with the eſcapes, how great or ſignal ſoever, of ſome individuals. For to undertake the Patrociny of every man in every Party, is that which none in his right wits will do: To deal therefore equally with you, I neither think your Party nor ours, culpable for the faults of ſome particular perſons. But, *Sir*, when a perverſe detracting Spirit gets in to theſe who pretend highly, certainly they ought to be told it, and that roundly too. For you know the greateſt danger to *Religion*, is to be apprehended from *the leaven of the Scribes and Phariſees*; ſince open and diſcernible faults do not ſo much prevail for infecting the *Chriſtian Societies*,

as theſe ſecret and more eaſily palliated errors. Conſider therefore a little what was the righteouſneſs of the *Phariſees*, and what was their leaven, and ſearch for it; leſt it *yet leaven you*, and *leſt your righteouſneſs exceed not theirs*. The *Phariſees* prayed often, and long, both in the Synagogues, ſtreets, and widows houſes: they ſtudied the Law exactly, and had a great reverence for *Moſes* and the *Prophets*, and much zeal againſt *blaſphemers, falſe teachers and hereticks*: They were ſtrict obſervers of the *Sabbath*, and were careful to prepare for their *Paſſover ſolemnities*: They had great reſpect for the *opinions of their Anceſtors*: They looked *grave and ſolemn*: They *faſted often, and gave tythes of all they had*: Their outward deportment was not only clean, but beautiful: They were zealous to gain *Proſelytes*, and expreſſed a tenderneſs of *conſcience*, even in the ſmalleſt matters: They were careful to avoid all converſe with profane or wicked perſons. In a word, they had many things, which to a vulgar and leſs diſcerning eye, made a fair ſhow in the fleſh. But with all this, they were proud, and exalted in their own conceits, ſo that they deſpiſed all other perſons: They were Magiſterial, and deſired to preſcribe to every body: They were full of empty boaſtings, and aſſumed to themſelves big and ſwelling Titles: and all their opinions they obtruded

as

as Oracles. *They did all to be ſeen of men, and loved ſalutations in the market places, and the uppermoſt rooms at feaſts.* They envied any they ſaw outſtrip them in true worth; and hated and contemned all that followed theſe. They ſtudied to calumniate and revile every perſon that oppoſed them, with the moſt unjuſt and cruel reproaches, excommunicating all who adhered to them: Neither would they yield to the cleareſt evidences were offered for their conviction: and nothing but the blood of the moſt innocent could ſatisfie their revenge. They were covetous, and *devoured widows houſes*, with their pretences of devotion. They were falſe and ſubdolous, ſtudying to enſnare others in their ſpeeches, or wreſt what they ſaid to a contrary and miſchievous ſenſe. They were traytors to theſe in Authority, though when it might ſerve their ends, they ſpared not to pretend much zeal for them: and the fervor of their zeal made them often attempt the murdering of thoſe who oppoſed them, and diſcovered their falſe pretexts, and miſchievous deſigns. And from this, let all Judge how much of that *Phariſaical leaven* doth yet lurk, and leaven among us. I know the application would be thought as invidious, as it is obvious. And, I pray GOD, thoſe guilty of theſe evils, may charge them home upon themſelves: For I confeſs, I love not that part

part of the *Chirurgeons trade* ſo well, as to dwell longer on the cutting of ulcers, or the ſearching of ſores: and theſe whom this general hint will not help to ſome conviction, would be little prevailed upon by a cloſer diſcovery of the parallel. But miſtake me not, as if I charged one party only with this leaven, which is, alas! too viſible among many of all ſides and parties. But to dwell no longer on generals, which every one will drive off himſelf, and lodge on others, let us now come to a cloſer review of our late times. And here, *Philarcheus*, I quit the Theme to you, who I know can manage it better.

Phil. Truly, when I reflect on the late times, and the ſpirit which did then act in the Judicatories both of Church and State, I wonder much how any can be guilty of the error of thinking it was the cauſe of GOD was then fought for. I deny not but a great many, yea, I am willing to hope the greater part, were miſled and abuſed, and did imagine it was *Religion and Liberties* they fought for; and ſo went out as they were called, in the ſimplicity of their heart, and knew not any thing of the ſecret deſigns of their Leaders: As in the caſe of *Abſoloms* rebellion, two hundred went from *Jeruſalem* with him, which might well a little excuſe their fault, but could not alleviate the guilt of that unnatural rebellion: ſo whatever may be ſaid for excuſing the multi-

multitudes, who, I doubt not, meant well, yet that will never ſerve for vindicating the courſe was followed. I confeſs, if I ſaw any remorſe or ſhame for by-paſt miſcarriages; if I found theſe people we ſpeak of, either humbled for them before GOD, or aſhamed of them among men, I ſhould be the laſt on earth who would upbraid them with them: and that the rather, that *His Majeſty* hath buried the remembrance of them by a gracious oblivion. But when they continue ſo inſolent, as ſtill to bear up ſo high in their pretentions, as if GOD had been viſibly with them: and when they think it an injury to their innocency to tell them of an indemnity, who would not be tempted to take them to task, and examine all their vain boaſtings, and empty pretences? to which I am both provoked from their arrogance, and invited from the evident proofs of all I ſhall alledge, which I can lay before you from authentical Papers and Regiſters: and I ſhall freely tell you, that if any of theſe Pamphleteers had but the half to ſay of theſe who yield a complyance to the preſent Eſtabliſhment, which I can ſay of them, the world would ring with it. But I count the defaming of men a work as mean, as it is cruel. Yet I look upon my ſelf as obliged to give ſome accounts of the ſpirit and ways of theſe people, which I ſhall do with all the

reſerve

reſerve and caution that becomes a Chriſtian.

Eud. Hold, hold, I pray you, run not too far in your carreer, leſt you lay open things were better hid: I confeſs theſe Writers do juſtly draw it from you; but for the faults of two or three, be not cruel to a multitude. And what will all you ſhall ſay avail? for we know well enough how little the cleareſt evidence will prevail upon their belief: And though I in particular, know upon what grounds you can go, for verifying all you undertake, and that they are unexceptionably clear; yet it is a dunghil not to be ſearched too much. Wherefore let me, with my moſt earneſt intreaties, divert you from the diſcourſe you have threatned *Iſotimus* with. But becauſe all theſe mens defences of the reſiſtance Subjects may make to their Sovereigns, go upon the principles of maintaining Religion and Liberties, when invaded by the Magiſtrate; we will therefore be beholden to you, if you ſatisfie us, whether the late wars, as they were begun and carried on, were defenſive or not?

Phil. Your authority over me is ſo entire, that your commands never fail of determining my obedience, therefore for this once I ſhall yield to your deſire, but with this declaration, that if *Iſotimus* cannot prevail among his friends, for conjuring that pamphleting ſpirit into

into ſilence, I will be forced on more freedom than I either deſign or deſire: and be made to tell name and ſurname of the Actors of many things, which they may wiſh lay dead: and be made to prove them from authentick papers and records, and diſcover a myſtery of iniquity, which hath lien long hid under fair pretences: and in a word, let you underſtand what were the arts, caballings, and intrigues of theſe who pretended ſo much to the intereſt of CHRIST, when they ſought their own: and if in doing this, I be forced on much round and plain dealing, the blame of it will fall to their ſhare who extort it from me. But I come now to ſatisfie your deſire, and doubt not to convince you, that the late wars were an invaſion of the Kings Authority, and of the eſtabliſhed Laws, and were not for defence of any part of the eſtabliſhed Religion and Liberties.

In the year 1638. His *Majeſty* having underſtood, that the authorizing of the Service-Book, and Book of Canons, and the eſtabliſhment of the High-Commiſſion-Courts were illegal; did upon the repreſentation of thoſe grievances, not only retract what he had formerly done, but in the fulleſt manner diſcharged them, and though the *Articles* of *Perth* ſtood ſetled by Law, yet upon their petitions, who counted them grievances, he warranted their

their diſuſe: and for ſecuring the fears of his Subjects of the change of Religion, (with which ſome factious ſpirits had poyſoned them;) he appointed the *National Covenant*, as King *James* had ſigned it, to be taken by all his Subjects with a bond of mutual defence and adherence to it: He alſo ſummoned an Aſſembly and Parliament, for ſatisfying all the juſt demands and grievances of his Subjects. But did this ſatisfie the zeal of that party? No, for when all colors of grounds were removed from thoſe malicious imputations, with which his *Majeſties* actions were aſperſed; then did they flee to their ſafe and ſure refuge of jealouſies and fears, out of which there was never any ſtorming of them, as if all had been only offered to trepan and deceive them. And after His *Majeſty* had called a Synod at *Glaſgow*, then came in the Lay-Elders, who were all of the Nobility, and men of the greateſt eminence of the Kingdom, and carried the elections of the members of the Aſſembly in the moſt arbitrary manner imaginable: many inſtances whereof I can yet prove from authentick papers, one generall I ſhall only name, (for did I ſtand to reckon up all, I ſhould never get to an end:) the ruling Elders who came from every Parioch to the Presbyteries, for electing the Commiſſioners to the Aſſembly, were men of power, and of one

one knot; and ſo when it was voted what Miniſters ſhould be choſen, they who were liſted, being at leaſt ſix, were ſet to the door, and thus the Elders who ſtayed within, carried the election as they pleaſed. And when the commiſſionated ruling Elder was choſen, they were all ſo aſſociated, that they could not chooſe wrong. And thus it was, that the ſecular men did intirely chooſe the members of the Aſſembly of *Glaſgow*. But before they went to it, a written citation of the Biſhops was ordered to be read through all the Churches of *Scotland*; wherein they were charged, as guilty of all the crimes imaginable, which as an *Agape* after the Lords Supper, was firſt read after a Communion at *Edinburgh*: and upon it, orders were ſent every where, for bringing in the privateſt of their eſcapes. (And you may judge how conſonant this was to that Royal Law of charity, *which covers a multitude of ſins*) nor was the Kings Authority any whit regarded all this while. Was ever greater contempt put on the largeſt offers of grace and favor? And when at *Glaſgow His Majeſty* offered by his Commiſſioner, to conſent to the limiting of Biſhops, nothing would ſatisfie their zeal without condemning the order, as unlawful and abjured. But when many illegalities of the conſtitution and procedure of that Aſſembly were diſcovered

red, their partiality appeared, for being both Judg and Party, they juſtified all their own diſorders. Upon which *His Majeſties* Commiſſioner was forced to diſcharge their further ſitting, ot procedure, under pain of Treaſon: but withal publiſhed *His Majeſties* Royal intentions to them, for ſatisfying all their legal deſires, and ſecuring their fears. But their ſtomachs were too great to yield obedience, and ſo they ſate ſtill, pretending their authority was from *CHRIST*, and condemned Epiſcopacy, excommunicated the Biſhops, with a great many other illegal and unjuſtifiable Acts. And when *His Majeſty* came with an Army to do himſelf right by the Sword *GOD* had put in his hands, they took the ſtart of him, and ſeiſed on his Caſtles, and on the houſes and perſons of his good Subjects, and went in a great body againſt him. Now in this *His Majeſty* had the Law clearly of his ſide: For Epiſcopacy ſtood eſtabliſhed by Act of Parliament. And if this was a cauſe of Religion, or a defence of it, much leſs ſuch as deſerved all that bloud and confuſion which it drew on, let all the World judg.

It is true, *His Majeſty* was willing to ſettle things, and receive them again into his grace, and upon the matter granted all their deſires: but they were unſatisfiable; upon which they again armed. But of this I ſhall not recount the

particulars, becauſe I hope to ſee a clear and unbyaſſed narration of theſe things ere long. Only one Villany I will not conceal, at the pacification at *Berwick*, ſeven Articles of Treaty were ſigned; But the Covenanters got a paper among them, which paſſed for the conditions of the agreement; though neither ſigned by his *Majeſty*, nor atteſted by Secretary or Clerk: and this being every where ſpread, his *Majeſty* challenged it as a Forgery: and all the *Engliſh* Lords who were of the Treaty, having declared upon Oath, that no ſuch paper was agreed on, it was burnt at *London* by the hand of the Hangman, as a ſcandalous paper. But this was from the Pulpits in *Scotland*, repreſented as a violation of the Treaty, and that the Articles of it were burnt. Theſe and ſuch were the Arts the men of that time uſed to inflame that bleſſed King's native Subjects againſt him.

But all theſe were ſmall matters to the following invaſion of *England*, *An.* 1643. For his *Majeſty* did *An.* 1641. come to *Scotland*, and give them full ſatisfaction to all, even their moſt unreaſonable demands; which he conſented to paſs into Acts of Parliaments. But upon his return into *England*, the woful rupture betwixt him and the two Houſes following; was our Church-party ſatisfied with the trouble they occaſioned him? No, they were not: for they did all

all they could to cheriſh and foment the Houſes in their inſolent Demands, chiefly about *Religion:* and were as forward in preſſing *England*'s uniformity with *Scotland*, as they were formerly in condemning the deſign of bringing *Scotland* to an uniformity with *England*.

I ſhall not engage further in the differences betwixt the King and the two Houſes, than to ſhew that His *Majeſty* had the Law clearly of his ſide, ſince he not only conſented to the redreſs of all grievances, for which the leaſt color of Law was alledged; but had alſo yielded to larger conceſſions for ſecuring the fears of his Subjects, than had been granted by all the Kings of *England* ſince the *Conqueſt*. Yet their demands were unſatisfiable without His *Majeſty* had conſented to the aboliſhing of Epiſcopacy, and diſcharge of the Liturgy, which neither his Conſcience, nor the Laws of *England* allowed of: ſo that the following War cannot be ſaid to have gone on the principles of defending *Religion*; ſince His *Majeſty* was invading no part of the eſtabliſhed *Religion*. And thus you ſee, that the War in *England* was for advancing a pretence of *Religion*. And for *Scotlands* part in it, no Sophiſtry will prove it defenſive: for His *Majeſty* had ſetled all matters to their hearts deſire, and by many frequent and ſolemn proteſtations, declared his reſolutions of obſerving

inviolably that agreement: neither did he ſo much as require their aſſiſtance in that juſt defence of his Authority, and the Laws, invaded by the two Houſes: though in the explication of the Covenant, *An.* 1639. it was agreed to, and ſworn, *That they ſhould in quiet manner, or in Arms, defend His Majeſties Authority, within or without the Kingdom, as they ſhould be required by His Majeſty, or any having his Authority.* But all the King deſired was, that *Scotland* might lie neutral in the quarrel, enjoying their happy tranquillity: yet this was not enough for your Churches zeal, but they remonſtrated that Prelacy was the great Mountain ſtood in the way of Reformation, which muſt be removed, and they ſent their Commiſſioners to the King with theſe deſires, which *His Majeſty* anſwered by a Writing yet extant under his own Royal hand, ſhewing, *That the preſent ſettlement of the Church of* England *was ſo rooted in the Law, that he could not conſent to a change, till a new form were agreed to, and preſented to him*: to which theſe at *Weſtminſter* had no mind: but he offered *all eaſe to tender Conſciences, and to call a Synod to judg of theſe differences, to which he was willing to call ſome Divines from Scotland, for hearing their opinions and reaſons.* At that time, Petitions came in from ſeveral *Preſbyteries* in *Scotland*, to the *Conſervators of the Peace*, inciting them to own the Parliaments

ments quarrel: upon which many of the Nobility, and others, ſigned a *Croſs Petition*, which had no other deſign, but the diverting theſe Lords from interrupting the *Peace of Scotland*, by medling in the *Engliſh* quarrel: upon which Thunders were given out againſt theſe *Petitioners*, both from the Pulpits, and the *Remonſtrances* of the *Commiſſion* of the *General Aſſembly*; and they led Proceſſes againſt all who ſubſcribed it. But *His Majeſty* ſtill deſired a neutrality from *Scotland*; and tho highly provoked by them, yet continued to bear, with more than humane patience, the affronts were put on his Authority. Yet for animating the people of *Scotland* into the deſigned War, the Leaders of that Party did every where ſtudy to poiſon the people with damnable jealouſies of the *King's inclination to Popery*, of his acceſſion to the *Maſſacre of Ireland*, and of his deſigns to ſubvert by force the late agreement with *Scotland*, if his Armies were bleſſed with ſucceſs in *England*. It were an endleſs work to tell all the ways were uſed for rooting theſe wicked jealouſies in the peoples hearts: neither were all *His Majeſties* proteſtations able to overcome them: yet in end, when *His Majeſty* finding what their *inclinations* were, did refuſe to admit the Commiſſioners from *Scotland* to mediate betwixt himſelf and the Houſes, they returned home; and immediately upon

that, contrary to all the Laws of *Scotland*, a great meeting of *Counſellors, Conſervators, and Commiſſioners for the publick burdens*, ordained a *Convention of Eſtates* to be ſummoned, which was never before done without the King's command, except in the minority of the Kings: neither did they ſo much as wait for the King's pleaſure, but only ſignified their reſolution to him, and deſired *His Commands* againſt the day prefixed. Here was an invaſion of the King's *Prerogative*, which deſerved a high Cenſure: yet ſo far did *His Majeſty*'s clemency, and love to his native Kingdom lead him, that he diſpenſed with this tranſgreſſion, and allowed their ſitting in a *Convention*, provided they meddled not in the buſineſs of *England*, nor raiſed an Army in order to it: But notwithſtanding this, they voted themſelves *a free Convention*, and not reſtricted to the bounds preſcribed in the King's Letter, which they refuſed to regiſtrate. And after this, they leagued with *England*. But having ſpoke my ſelf out of breath, I quit the giving account of what follows to *Baſilius*.

Baſil. I have obſerved one defect in your Narration, for which I will be very favorable to you, becauſe I intend to be guilty of that ſame fault my ſelf; which is, that you have ſpoken nothing of the *National Covenant*, and I mean to ſay as little of the *League*. And I am apt to gueſs that your

your ſilence was deſigned upon the ſame grounds that mine is: for indeed I can ſatisfie my ſelf with nothing I can ſay upon the *League*, except I told all I know of the Arts and manner of its contrivance. And truly, I cannot prevail upon my ſelf at preſent, for the ſaying of that. Therefore I will draw a vail over it, and ſay nothing, till I ſee further reaſon for a more full diſcovery; and then I am afraid *Iſotimus* ſhall confeſs, it was not prudently done to have extorted it from me. But to quit this, and purſue the Narration *Philarchæus* hath devolved on me, I ſhall tell you how Commiſſioners came from *England* to treat for an Army from *Scotland*, for their aſſiſtance in the War they were then engaged in againſt the King: Upon which all Articles being agreed to, and a *League* ſworn, an Army was ſent into *England*, which turned the ſcales that did then hang in an even ballance, to the King's ruin. And truly, my invention cannot reach an argument, or color, for proving theſe to have been defenſive Arms, they being the effect of a combination with the Subjects of *England* againſt our common King. But ſhall I next tell you what followed after the fatal revolution of things in *England*, upon his *Majeſties* truſting himſelf to the *Scots Army*, I am ſure I ſhould fill your minds with horror. For though *His Majeſty* offered Conceſſions, juſtly to be wondered

at, he having been willing to quit the *Militia* for divers years, and to ſet up *Presbytery* for three years; and that in the mean while there ſhould be a *free Synod*, in order to a final ſettlement with other great diminutions of Royal Authority; which ſhew how willing he was at his own coſt to have redeemed the *peace of his Kingdoms*: only he added, *that his Conſcience could not allow him to take the Covenant*, nor authorize it by Law, nor conſent to the abolition of *Epiſcopacy*, or the *Liturgy*; proteſting that how ſoon he could do theſe things with a good Conſcience, he ſhould yield to all the deſires of his Subjects: in the mean while, he intreated for a perſonal Treaty, in order to mutual ſatisfaction. Yet with how much fury did that Party preſs the ſetling of the *Government* without him, the diſowning his intereſt, and the abandoning of his Perſon to his Enemies; tho at that very time, the deſigns of the *Sectarian Party*, againſt both *Monarchy* and *His Majeſties* Perſon, were breaking out, and had been made known to them by thoſe who underſtood them well? What followed upon this, I wiſh my ſilence could bury from the knowledg of all the World. But, alas! it is too well known what infamy theſe Men brought upon themſelves, and their Country: which in the Opinion of the World, was generally held guilty of that which was the Crime of the prevailing

Party,

Party, whom the Leaders over-awed and influenced. But after that, when *His Majeſty* was made Priſoner; when he was carried up and down by the Army; when the Army forced both the Houſes, and the City of *London*; when the *Treaties* of *Scotland* were violated in all their Articles; when the Propoſitions agreed on by both *Kingdoms*, were laid aſide, and the four Bills ſet in their place, wherein the *Covenant* was not mentioned; when upon *His Majeſties* refuſing of theſe he was made Priſoner, and the Vote of Non-addreſſes paſſed againſt him, then did the Loyalty of the *Scots Nation* begin again to revive: and what through the ſenſe of duty, what through the remorſe of their former actings, every one was forward to real reſentments of theſe unworthy indignities put both on *their King and Country*: but when the *Parliament of Scotland* had voted the Country to be put in a poſture of War for the defence of their *Sovereign*, then where ſhould I end, if I told all the ſeditious Papers, Preachings, and Diſcourſes of ſome of the *Clergy*, who contradicted and countermanded the *Parliament* to a height of unparalelled boldneſs, even after all their deſires, which they gave in a large *Remonſtrance*, were granted? But did that ſatisfie? No: they then took refuge in their *common Sanctuary* of jealouſies and fears. They threatned all

all who obeyed the commands of the *Parliament*, not only with their *Church-cenſures*, but with *damnation*. They did every where incite the people to riſe in Arms againſt the *Parliaments* Forces: and at a *Communion at Matchlin*, they did ſo work upon the Vulgar, that they prevailed to get them draw up in a Body, promiſing them great aſſiſtance both from *GOD* and men. They kept a *correſpondence* with the *Sectarian Army*, and continued by many Letters to preſs their ſpeedy march unto *Scotland*; and after the *Scots Army* marched unto *England*, and was by the wiſe judgment of *GOD* defeated, then did many of the Miniſters, with all the vehemence imaginable, inflame the people to Rebellion, and got them to riſe, and they marched before their *Pariſhes* like Captains. They alſo called for the help of the *Sectarian Army* to them. And thus did they ſtand to the *Covenant, in maintaining the Privileges of Parliament, and preſerving the King's Perſon and Authority*. And when *His Majeſty* was murdered, what attempts made they for the *preſervation of His Perſon*, or for the reſenting it after it was done? This was the Loyalty of that Party; and this is what all Princes may expect from you, unleſs they be abſolutely at your Devotion. Let theſe things declare whether theſe Wars went upon the grounds of a pure defence. But if next to this,

I ſhould reckon up the inſtances of Cruelty that appeared in your Judicatories for ſeveral years, I ſhould have too large a Theme to run through in a ſhort Diſcourſe. What cruel Acts were made againſt all who would not ſign the *Covenant*? They were declared Enemies to *GOD*, the King, and the Country. Their perſons were appointed to be ſeized on, and their goods confiſcated. And in the *November* of the year 1643. when ſome of the moſt eminent of the Nobility refuſed to ſign the *Covenant*, Commiſſions were given to Soldiers to bring them in Priſoners, warranting them to kill them if they made reſiſtance. And, pray, whether had this more of the cruelty of *Antichriſt*, or of the meekneſs of *JESUS*? Or ſhall I next tell you of the *bloody Tribunals* were at S. *Andrews*, and other places after *Philips-haughs*? And of the cruelty againſt thoſe Priſoners of War, who bore Arms at the King's command, and in defence of his authority? What bloudy Stories could I here tell, if I had not a greater horror at the relating them, than many of theſe high Pretenders had at the acting of them? And ſhould I here recount the procedure of the *Kirk Judicatories*, againſt all who were thought diſaffected, I would be look'd on as one telling *Romances*, they being beyond credit. What *Proceſſes of Miniſters* are yet upon Record, which have no better

better foundation than their not preaching to the times: their ſpeaking with, or praying before *My Lord Montroſe:* their not railing at the *Engagement*, and the like? And what cruelty was practiſed in the years 1649. and 1650? None of us are ſo young, but we may remember of it. A ſingle death of one of the greateſt of the Kingdom, could not ſatisfie the bloud-thirſty malice of that Party, unleſs made formidable and diſgraceful, with all the ſhameful pageantry could be deviſed. Pray, do you think theſe things are forgotten? Or ſhall I go about to narrate, and prove them more particularly? I confeſs, it is a ſtrange thing to ſee men who are ſo obnoxious, notwithſtanding that ſo exalted in their own conceits: and withal remember that the things I have hinted at, were not the particular actings of ſingle and private perſons, but the publick and owned proceedings of the Courts and Judicatories. Theſe are the grounds which perſuade me that with whatſoever fair colours ſome may varniſh theſe things, yet the ſpirit that then acted in that Party, was not the Spirit of *GOD*.

Iſot. Truly, you have given in a high charge againſt the proceedings of the late times, which as I ought not to believe upon your aſſertion, ſo I cannot well anſwer; thoſe being matters of fact, and done moſt of them before I was capable of

of obſerving things: And therefore when I ſee men of great experience, I ſhall ask after the truth of what you have told me. But whatever might be the deſign of ſome *Politicians* at that time, or to whatever bad ſenſe ſome words of the *League* may be ſtretched, yet you cannot deny, but they are capable of a good ſenſe, and in that I own them, and ſo cleave to that *Oath of GOD*, which was intended for *a ſolemn Covenanting with GOD*: and the people meant nothing elſe by it, but a giving themſelves to *Chriſt*: to whoſe truths and Ordinances they reſolved to adhere at all hazards, and againſt all oppoſition: and in particular to oppoſe every thing might bear down the power and progreſs of *Religion*, which was the conſtant effect of Prelacy: therefore we are all bound to oppoſe it upon all hazards. And indeed when I remember of the *beauty of holineſs* was then every where, and conſider the licencious profanity, and ſcoffing at *Religion*, which now abounds: this is ſtronger with me than all arguments, to perſuade me that theſe were the men of *GOD*, *who had his Glory before their eyes* in all they did, or deſigned: whereas now I ſee every one *ſeeking their own things, and none the things of JESUS CHRIST*. And all theſe plagues and evils which theſe Kingdoms do either groan under, or may apprehend, ought to be impu-

imputed to *GODS* avenging wrath for *a broken Covenant*, which though taken by all from the higheſt to the loweſt, is now condemned, reviled, abjured, and ſhamefully broken. Theſe things ſhould afflict our ſouls, and ſet us to our mournings, *if haply GOD may turn from the fierceneſs of his anger.*

Phil. As for theſe Articles that relate to the combination for engaging by arms in prejudice of the Kings Authority, or may ſeem to bind us to the reacting theſe Tragedies, they being founded on the lawfulneſs of Subjects reſiſting their Sovereigns, if the unlawfulneſs of that was already evinced, then any obligation can be in that compact for that effect, muſt be of it ſelf null and void: and therefore, as from the beginning it was ſinful to engage in theſe wars; ſo it will be yet more unlawful, if after all the evils we have ſeen, and the judgments we have ſmarted under, any would lick up that vomit: or pretend to bind a tye on the Subjects Conſciences to riſe in arms againſt their Lawful Sovereign. And let me tell you freely, I cannot be ſo blind or ſtupid, as not to apprehend that *GODS* wrath hath appeared very viſibly againſt us now, for a tract of thirty years and more; neither doth his *anger ſeem to be turned away, but his hand is ſtretched out ſtill.* But that which I look on as the greater matter of his contro-

troverſie with us, is that the Rulers of our Church and State did engage the ignorant multitude, under the colors of *Religion*, to deſpiſe the *LORDS anointed, and his Authority*, and by Arms to ſhake off his yoak, and afterwards abandon his Perſon, diſown his intereſt, refuſe to engage for his reſcue, and in the end look on tamely, and ſee him murdered. Do you think it a ſmall crime that nothing could ſatisfie the Leaders in that time, without they got the poor people entangled into things which they knew the vulgar did not, and could not underſtand, or judge of, and muſt implicitly rely upon the Gloſſes of their Teachers? For whatever the *General Aſſembly* declared, was a duty following upon the *Covenant* (which was an eaſie thing for the leading men to carry as they pleaſed) then all the Miniſters muſt either have preached and publiſhed that to their people, with all their zeal, otherwiſe they were ſure to be turned out. The people being thus provoked from the Pulpits, they were indeed to be pitied, who being engaged in an oath (many of them, no doubt in ſingleneſs of heart, having the fear of an oath upon their conſciences) and not being able to examine things to the bottom, were entangled thus, and engaged which way the *leading Church-men* pleaſed. and the guilt of this, as it was great in thoſe who without due conſidera-

tion

tion engaged in those oaths, so it was most fearful in them; who against the clear *convictions of conscience*, were prevailed upon by the thunders of the Church, or the threats of the State, to swear what they judged sinful. I confess, their crime was of a high and crying nature, who did thus for the love of this present world, not only make *shipwreck of a good conscience*, but persisted long in a tract of dissembling with *GOD*, and juggling with men. But the wickedness of this comes mainly to their door, who tempted them to prevarication by their severities against all refused a concurrence in these courses. And the sin of all this was the greater, that it was carried on with such pretences, as if it had been the cause and work of *GOD*, with fasting, prayers, tears, and shews of devotion. For these things the Land mourns, and *GOD* continues his controversie against us. To which I must add the great impenitence of those who being once engaged in that course of *Rebellion*, have not yet repented of the works of their hands. For even such as own a *conviction* for it, do not express that horror and remorse at their by-past crimes which become penitents: But think if by rioting, drinking and swearing, they declare themselves now of another mind than formerly they were of, that they are washed free of that defilement. In a word, none seem deeply humbled in the

presence

preſence of *GOD*, for the ſinfulneſs of theſe practices, into which they entered themſelves, and engaged others. And till I ſee an ingenuous ſpirit of *confeſſing and repenting* for theſe great evils, for all that rebellion, that bloud, oppreſſon, and vaſtation which theſe courſes drew on, I ſhall never expect a *National pardon*, for that *National guilt*. For when on the one hand, many are ſtill juſtifying theſe black Arts, and not humbled for them, nor owning their penitence as openly as they committed their ſins: And on the other hand, theſe who confeſs the faultineſs of their courſes, do it in a ſpirit of traducing others, of railing, and reviling, perhaps not without Atheiſtical ſcoffings at *true Religion*; but not in a ſpirit of ingenuous horror, and ſorror for their own acceſſion to theſe courſes, it appears we are ſtill hardened, either into a judicial blindneſs of the one hand, or of obduration of heart on the other. That profanity doth much abound, I muſt with ſorrow confeſs it, in the preſence of my *GOD*: And I know there are many who roll themſelves in the duſt daily before *GOD*, and mourn bitterly for it: But when I enter in a deeper inquiry what may be the true cauſes of it, thoſe that occur to me are, firſt, a judicial ſtroke from *GOD* upon us, for our by-paſt abominations: and chiefly for our hypocritical mocking of *GOD*, faſtning the

deſigns or humors of a Party on him, as if they had been his Ordinances, intereſts, and truths. And therefore becauſe *we held the truth of GOD in unrighteouſneſs*, his wrath hath been revealed againſt us. Next, the frequent involving the Land in reiterated Oaths, ſubſcriptions, and profeſſions of repentance, under ſevere Cenſures, which prevailed with many to ſwallow them over implicitly, and made others yield to them againſt their Conſcience, hath ſo debauched and proſtituted the Souls of people, that it is no wonder, they be now, as ſeared with a hot Iron, and incapable of reproofs or convictions. Beſides, is it any wonder that theſe whoſe hearts naturally led them to Atheiſm, when they ſee what juggling was uſed about ſome pretences of Religion, and how the whole Land was involved in ſo much bloud, about ſuch trifling matters, come thereupon to have a jealouſie of Preachers and preaching, as if all they ſaid, was but to maintain and advance their own intereſts and greatneſs, and thereupon turn Scoffers at all Religion, becauſe of the baſe and irreligious practices of ſome, who yet vouched *GOD* and *CHRIST* for all they did? And on remark I ſhall offer on the way, that the ſin of your Church was legible in your judgment: their ſin was the animating the people to Rebellion, upon colors of Religion; and their judgment was, not only

only to be ſubdued, and oppreſſed by another rebellious Army, who were not wanting to pretend highly to the cauſe of *GOD* in all their actings: but that they brake in pieces among themſelves about a deciſion, who might be imployed to ſerve in the Army, which at firſt diſjointed, and afterwards deſtroyed your Church: and the ſchiſm is ſtill among us, which is like to eat up the power of Religion, is but the dreg and genuin effect of theſe courſes, and ſo all the prejudice it produceth to Religion, and the true intereſts of Souls is to be charged upon that ſame ſcore.

Iſot. Really, I am much ſcandalized with this Diſcourſe, which if it were heard abroad, I know would much offend the hearts of the *LORD*'s people. And indeed, I think it ought not to be anſwered, no more than *Rabſhaketh's railings* were by *Eliakim*. I wiſh I could with good *Hezekiah ſpread it out before the LORD, and mourn over it*, and for you who do ſo blaſpheme *GOD*, and his Cauſe. But whatever you may ſay in the point of Reſiſtance, yet you cannot deny, but we are all from the higheſt to the loweſt bound in our ſtations (at leaſt) to withſtand Prelacy, againſt which we did ſo formally ſwear in that Oath of *GOD*, which moſt of you are not only content to break, but muſt needs deſpiſe and mock at.

Phil. GOD is my witneſs, how little pleaſure I have in this ſevere Diſcourſe, into which the petulancy of theſe Writers hath engaged me: but examine what I ſaid from *Religion* and Reaſon, and you will perhaps change your verdict of it. For my part, I ſay none of theſe things in a corner, neither do I expect that they ſhall not fly abroad, and if they do, I will look for all the ſeverities which the cenſures and malice of many can amount to. But I will chearfully bear that croſs, and will be content to be yet more vile, for declaring freely what I judg to be *GOD*'s Controverſie with the Land I live in. If for this love to Souls, many be my Adverſaries, I will betake my ſelf to prayer: and ſhall only add this, that few who know me ſuſpect my temper guilty either of flattery or bitterneſs. And the ſearcher of hearts knows, that I neither deſign by this freedom, to commend my ſelf to any, nor to diſgrace others, but meerly to propoſe things as they are. If this produce any good effect, I have my deſign; if not, I have diſcharged my conſcience, and leave the iſſue of it with *GOD*, who can out of the mouths of babes and ſucklings, ordain ſtrength and perfect praiſe.

As for any obligation you may ſuppoſe the Covenant brings upon us to oppoſe Epiſcopacy, I ſhall diſcuſs it with all the clearneſs I am maſter

maſter of. I ſhall not tell you, how much many who took that Covenant, and do ſtill plead its obligation have ſaid (from the words of the ſecond Article, and the explication given in it to Prelacy) for reconciling as much of Epiſcopacy as is ſetled among us, to it, according to the declared meaning of its firſt impoſers, when they took it, and authorized it. But leaving you and them to contend about this, upon the whole matter conſider, that Epiſcopacy is either neceſſary, unlawful, or indifferent: if the firſt be true, then you will without much ado confeſs that no Oath in prejudice of a neceſſary duty, can bind any tie upon our conſcience. If it be unlawful, I ſhall freely acknowledg that from the oaths of the Covenants, there is a ſupervenient tie lying on us for its extirpation. But if it be indifferent, then I ſay it was a very great ſin for a Nation, ſo far to bind up their Chriſtian liberty, as by Oath to determine themſelves to that to which *GOD* had not obliged them: for the circumſtances of things indifferent, may ſo far vary, that what is of it ſelf indifferent, may by the change of theſe become neceſſary, or unlawful. Therefore, in theſe matters, it is a great invaſion of our Chriſtian liberty, to fetter conſciences with Oaths. And though the Rulers and chief Magiſtrates of a Society, have either raſhly or out of fear, or upon other unjuſtifiable

accounts, ſworn an Oath, about indifferent things, which afterwards becomes highly prejudicial to the *Society*, then they muſt conſider that the *Government* of that *State* is put in their hands by *GOD*, to whom they muſt anſwer for their adminiſtration. Theeefore they ſtand bound by the *Laws of Nature, of Religion, and of all Societies*, to do every thing that may tend moſt for the good of the *Society*. And if a Caſe fall in where a thing tends much to the good and peace of a Land, but the Prince ſtands bound ſome way or other by Oath againſt it, he did indeed ſin by ſo ſwearing; but ſhould ſin much more, if by reaſon of that Oath he judged himſelf limited from doing what might prove for the good of the *Society*. Indeed when an Oath concerns only a man's private rights, it ties him to performance, *tho to his hurt*; but the *adminiſtration of Government* is none of theſe rights a Magiſtrate may diſpoſe of at pleaſure; For he muſt conduct himſelf ſo, as he ſhall be anſwerable to *God*, whoſe Vicegerent he is: and when theſe two Obligations interfere, the one of procuring the good of the *Society*, the other of adhering to an Oath, ſo that they ſtand in terms of direct oppoſition, then certainly the greater muſt ſwallow up the leſſer. It is therefore to be under conſideration, whether the Obligation of procuring the good of the *Society*, or that

of

of the Magiſtrates Oath be the greater? But this muſt be ſoon decided, if it be conſidered that the former is an Obligation lying on him by *GOD*, who for that end raiſed him up to his power, and is indeed the very end of *Government*: whereas the other is a voluntary engagement he hath taken on himſelf, and can never be equal to that which was antecedent to it, much leſs juſtle it out. But if it contradict the other, the Magiſtrate is indeed bound to repent for his raſh ſwearing; but cannot be imagined from that to be bound to go againſt the good of the *Society*, for the procuring whereof, he hath the Sword and power put in his hands by *GOD*. And ſo much of the tie can lie upon a Magiſtrate by his Oath about things indifferent, in ordering or governing the State that is ſubject to him: in which he muſt proceed as he ſhall anſwer to *GOD* in the great day of his accounts: and ought not to be cenſured or judged for what he doth by his Subjects.

But he enacting Laws in matters indifferent, they become neceſſary Obligations on his Subjects, which no private oath of theirs can make void. Indeed the late Writer his arguing againſt this, is ſo ſubtil, that I cannot comprehend it ſo far as to find ſenſe in it; for he confeſſeth, *Pag.* 232. *That the Magiſtrate is veſted with a power proportional to the ends of Government, ſo that no*

Subject may decline his lawful commands, or bind himself by any such Oath, as may interfere with a supervenient rational command. All this is sound, and indeed all I pleaded; only his explication of *rational*, I cannot allow of: For tho a Magistrate may proceed to unreasonable commands, yet I see no limits set to our obedience, but from the unlawfulness of them. But in the next *page*, he eats all this up by telling, *That there are many things still left to our selves, and our own free disposal, wherein we may freely vow: and having vowed, must not break our word.* And for instance, he adduceth *a mans devoting the tenth of his substance to the* Lord, *from which no countermand of the Magistrates can excuse.* But still he concludes, *Page* 334. *That the Magistrates Power may make void such vows as are directly, or designedly made to frustrate its right, or to suspend the execution of others, in so far as they do eventually cross its lawful exercise.* This last yields to me all I pretend in this case: For the *Covenant* being made on purpose to exclude *Episcopacy*, though at that time setled by Law: if *Episcopacy* be not unlawful, but lawful, which I now suppose, then the King's authority enjoining it, and it being a great part likewise of the *Government* of the Subjects, it is to be submitted to, notwithstanding the Oath made against it. So that your Friend yields without consideration, that which he thinks he denies:

and

and therefore the reaſoning in the *Dialogues* holds good, that the Oath of a Subject in a matter indifferent, cannot free him from the obedience he owes the Laws. It is true, his *private vows* in matters of his own concern, are of another nature, and ſo not within the compaſs of this Debate, which is only about *the obedience we owe the Laws*, ſuppoſing their matter lawful, notwithſtanding our Compacts made in oppoſition to them: and therefore I ſhall not diſcourſe of them, but ſtick cloſe to the purpoſe in hand. But my next undertaking muſt be to free Children from any tie may be imagined to lie on them from the Fathers Oath: which was a matter ſo clear to my thinking, that I wonder what can be ſaid againſt it.

Iſot. Indeed here your Friend the *Conformiſt* bewrayed his ignorance notably, not conſidering the authority Parents have over their Children by *divine command*, which dies not with them; their commands being obligatory even after their death: for *God* commends the *Rechabites* for obeying *Jonadabs* command ſome ages after his death: Therefore Parents adjuring Children, they are obliged by it, as the people of *Iſrael* by *Saul's* adjuring them not to eat food till the evening, were obliged to obedience. And ſuch adjurations may not only bind the Children adjured, but all their poſterity after them: as did

did the Oath for carrying *Joſeph*'s bones out of *Egypt*. And further, a *Society* continuing ſtill under the ſame notion, is bound through all ages to make good the compacts of their *Progenitors*, they continuing to be the ſame *Society*. And this is not only the ground on which the obligation of all alliances among Kingdoms is founded; but is alſo the *baſis* on which our tie to the *Allegiance due to our Sovereign* is grounded. Therefore as we find *GOD* in Scripture covenanting with Men, and their poſterity, as in *Abraham*'s caſe, and Fathers likewiſe engaging to *GOD* for themſelves and their Children, as did *Joſhua* for himſelf and his Houſe; ſo our *Covenants* being unanimouſly ſworn by almoſt the whole Nation, and confirmed by all the authority in it, muſt have a perpetual obligation on all the ſubſequent Generations. *See from pag.* 205. *to pag.* 219.

Phil. I ſuppoſe, if it hold good that the *Covenant* binds not theſe who took it, to oppoſe or extirpate *Epiſcopacy* when ſetled by Law, all this reaſoning will of it ſelf evaniſh in ſmoak: But to give your Diſcourſe all advantage, and to yield its obligation on theſe who took it, what you infer will never be made out; ſince it is founded on the ſuppoſition of a Parents authority to adjure his Child, that ties him after his Fathers death, which you apply to the *Covenant*.

But

But in this there is a triple error committed by you: one of fact, and two of right. That of fact, is, that you suppose that in the *Covenant* the subsequent *generations* are adjured to its observance: whereas not a word of this is in the *Covenant*. On the contrary, in the end of the Preface to the *League*, it is said, that *every one for himself doth swear*: Neither is there a word in it all that imports an adjuration on *posterity*. It is true, in the 5. *Article*, every one is bound according to their place and interest, to endeavour that the *Kingdoms may remain conjoined in a firm peace and union to all posterity*. But he that will draw an adjuration on posterity from this, must have a new Art of *Logick*, not yet known. And in the *National Covenant*, as it was taken by King *James*, there is not a word that imports an adjuration on *posterity*. It is true, in the addition was made to it, *Ann.* 1638. it is declared, *That they are convinced in their minds, and confess with their mouths, that the present and subsequent generations in this Land, were bound to keep that National Oath and subscription inviolable*. But this was only their opinion who signed it: Yet for all that, there is no adjuration on *posterity* for observing it, no not in that *Addition* then sworn to. The next error of your *Hypothesis*, is, that the Parents commands can bind the *Childrens conscience*, in prejudice of the Magistrates authority: for you must

muſt either ſuppoſe this, otherwiſe your arguing is to no purpoſe, ſince the King's authority is in this caſe interpoſed, and therefore all our Fathers commands muſt yield to it: which becauſe none deny, I ſhall not ſtand to evince. For if my Father be bound to obey the King, as well as I am; both he ſins, if he enjoin me diſobedience, and I am likewiſe guilty, if upon that I diſobey. For he that hath no warrant for his own diſobedience, can be imagined to have none for ſecuring me in mine. And in end, you ſuppoſe a Parents command or authority can bind the Conſcience after his death: which is manifeſtly abſurd; for certainly his authority muſt die with himſelf. It is true, a piety and reverence is due to the memory of our Parents: and ſo much reverence ſhould be payed to their aſhes, that without a very good reaſon, the things they enjoyned ſhould be religiouſly obſerved? but this is not a neceſſary Obligation: for circumſtances may ſo vary things, that we may be aſſured, that as our Parents enjoyned ſuch a thing, ſo had they ſeen the inconveniencies of it, they had not done it. Now while a Father lives, a Child hath this liberty to argue with him: where it is not to be doubted, but the affection of a Parent, together with the reaſons adduced would make him change his Commands: but indeed did their Commands tie us after

after their death, we ſhould be more in ſubjection to our Parents, when dead, than we were when they lived: which goeth againſt the ſenſe of all mankind. And what equality is there in ſuch mens reaſons, who will deny abſolute obedience to Magiſtrates, tho we be allowed to petition, and repreſent the grievances their Laws bring upon us, and yet will aſſert an abſolute and blind obedience due to the commands of our Parents, tho dead? Your inſtance of the *Rechabites* makes againſt you, for their Progenitors had appointed them to dwell in Tents, yet the fear of *Nebuchadnezzar* had driven them to *Jeruſalem:* and conſider if the incurring our lawful Sovereigns diſpleaſure, together with the hazard ſuch obedience may draw after it, be not a juſter ground of excuſing our ſelves from obedience to any ſuch Command, ſuppoſe it were real. The *Rechabites* did indeed abſtain from Wine, upon *Jonadab*'s command, for which they are commended, and bleſſed; and ſo I acknowledg it a piece of piety to obey the commands even of a dead Father; yet in that place, it is not aſſerted, that that Command tied their Conſcience; but on the contrary, the bleſſing paſſed upon their obedience, ſeems rather to imply that it was voluntary, though generous and dutiful. The ſame Anſwer is to be made to *Joſeph*'s adjuring the Children

dren of *Israel* to carry up his bones; which ought to have obliged even the Children of these that were so adjured, out of the gratitude due to the memory of so great a Man, especially nothing intervening that rendered obedience to it, either unexpedient or unlawful.

But in general, consider that when a contract is made, either of an *Association* under a form and line of Magistracy, or of alliance betwixt two States, and confirmed by Oath; there is an obligation of Justice that ariseth from the Compact, whereby such rights were translated unto the person compacted with: and thereby he and his posterity according to the Compact, are to enjoy these Rights, because translated unto his person by the Compact: but being once legally his, with a provision that they shall descend to his Heirs, then his Heirs have a right to them formally in their persons after his death, to which they have a title in justice, and not by the fidelity to which the posterity of the first compacters are bound by their Fathers deed, but because the right is now theirs: so that though the first Compacters were bound by promise and Oath, their Successors are only bound by the rules of justice, of giving to every man that which is his right: therefore whatever our *Ancestors* may be supposed to have compacted with the *Kings Progenitors*, or whatever by Treaty one

one State yields over to another, that *Promiſe, Donation and Oath* is indeed the ground on which the Kings right may be ſuppoſed to have been firſt founded. But now his Title to our Obedience proceeds upon the rules of Juſtice, (of giving him what is his, by an immemorial Poſſeſſion, paſſed all preſcription, ſo many ages ago, that the firſt veſtiges of it cannot be traced from *Records*, or certain *Hiſtories*) and not of fidelity of obſerving the promiſes of our *Anceſtors* to him, though I do not deny a pious Veneration to be due to the Promiſes and Oaths of Parents, when they contain in them adjurations on their Childern. And thus the *Gibeonites* having a right to their lives, confirmed to them by the Compact of the Princes of *Iſrael*: they and their Poſterity had a good title in Juſtice to their lives, which was baſely invaded by *Saul*, and had this aggravation, that the compact made with them was confirmed by oath, for which their poſterity ſhould have had a juſt veneration: But though that Oath did at firſt found their title to their Lives, and their Exemption from the forfeiture all the *Amorites* lay under; yet afterwards their title was preſerved upon the *rules of Juſtice*, and the Laws *of Nature*, which forbid the invading the lives of our Neighbors, when by no Injury they forfeit them. Thus your confounding the titles of Inheritance

heritance and preſcription, with the grounds upon which they firſt accreſced, hath engaged you into all this miſtaking. But from all this, you ſee how ill founded that reaſoning of the *Anſwerer of the Dialogues is*, for proving the poſterity of theſe who took the *Covenant*, tied by their fathers oath, which yet at firſt view, promiſed as fair colors of reaſon, as any part of his Book, had he not intermixed it with ſhameful inſultings and railings at the *Conformiſt*: which I ſuppoſe do now appear as ill grounded, as they are cruel and baſe. But I am not ſo much in love with that ſtile, as to recriminate: nor ſhall I tell you of his errors that way of which I am in good earneſt aſhamed upon his account: For it is a ſtrange thing, if a man cannot anſwer a diſcourſe without he fall a fleering and railing. To conclude this whole purpoſe, I am miſtaken, if much doubting will remain with an ingenuous and unprejudged Reader, if either we or our poſterity lye under any obligation from the Covenants, to contradict or counteract the Laws of the Land, ſuppoſing the matter of them lawful: which being a large Subject, will require a diſcourſe apart. But I will next examine ſome practices among us, and chiefly that of Schiſm and ſeparation from the publick worſhip of *GOD*; to which both the unity of the Spirit, which we ought to preſerve in the bond of

of peace, and the lawful commands of these in authority, do so bind us, that I will be glad to hear what can be alledged for it.

Iſot. A great difference is to be made betwixt ſeparation and non-compliance: the one is a withdrawing from what was once owned to be the Church: the other is a with-holding our concurrence from what we judg brought in upon the Church, againſt both Reaſon and Religion: and any thing you can draw from *CHRIST*'s practice or precept, in acknowledging the *High Prieſts*, or commanding the people to obſerve what the *Phariſees* taught them, is not applicable to this purpoſe: For firſt, theſe were Civil Magiſtrates, as well as Eccleſiaſticks, and Doctors of the Civil and Judicial Law, which is different from the Caſe of Churchmen with us. Further, the *Jewiſh* Church was ſtill in poſſeſſion of the privileges given them from *GOD*, and ſo till *CHRIST* erected his Church, they were the Church of *GOD*: and therefore to be acknowledged, and joined with in Worſhip. But how vaſtly differs our Caſe from this? *See from p.* 189. *to p.* 204.

Phil. You have given a ſhort account of the large reaſonings of the late Book on this head, only he is ſo browilled in it, that there are whole pages in his Diſcourſe, which I confeſs my weakneſs cannot reach. But to clear the way

for your ſatisfaction in this matter, which I look upon as that of greateſt concernment, next to the Doctrine of Non-reſiſtance, of any thing is debated among us; ſince it diſſolves the unity of the Church; and opens a patent door to all diſorder, Ignorance and Profanity. I ſhall conſider what the unity of the Church is, and in what manner we are bound to maintain and preſerve it.

All Chriſtians are commanded to love one another, and to live in peace together: and in order to this, they muſt alſo unite, and concur in joint Prayers, Adorations, and other acts of Worſhip, to expreſs the harmony of their love in Divine matters: Sacraments were alſo inſtituted for uniting the body together; being ſolemn and federal ſtipulations, made with *God*, in the hands of ſome who are his Ambaſſadors and Repreſentatives upon Earth: by whoſe mouths the Worſhip is chiefly offered up to *God*, and who muſt be ſolemnly called and ſeparated for their Imployment. Now theſe Aſſemblings of the Saints are not to be forſaken, till there be ſuch a Corruption in the Conſtitution of them, or in ſome part of the Worſhip, that we cannot eſcape the guilt of that, without we ſeparate our ſelves from theſe unclean things. Wherefore the warning is given, *Come out of Babylon, that we be not partakers of her*

ſins

ſins, and ſo receive not of her plagues. But though there be very great and viſible corruptions in a Church; yet as long as our joining in Worſhip in the ſolemn Aſſemblies, doth not neceſſarily involve us into a Conſent or Concurrence with theſe; we ought never to withdraw, nor rent the unity of the body, whereof CHRIST is the head. Conſider, *how pleaſant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.* And our Saviour ſheweth of what importance he judged it to his Church, ſince ſo great a part of his laſt and moſt raviſhing Prayer, is, *That they might be one:* And this he five times repeats, comparing the unity he prayed for, to the *undivided Unity was betwixt him and his Father.* How ſhall theſe words riſe up in Judgment, againſt thoſe who have broken theſe *bonds of perfection* upon ſlight grounds! With the ſame earneſtneſs do we find the Apoſtles preſſing the *Unity of the Body, and Charity* among all the members of it: which is no where more amply done than in the *Epiſtles* to the *Corinthians*, whom the Apoſtle calls, *the Churches of GOD*; and yet there were among them falſe Teachers, who ſtudied to prey upon them, and to ſtrike out the *Apoſtles authority:* Some among them denied the *reſurrection*, there were Contentions and Diſorders among them in their meetings: ſuch confuſions were from the *ſtrange Tongues* ſome ſpake, that had one unac-

quainted with them, come in upon them, he had judged them mad: ſome were drunk when they did receive the *LORD*'s Supper: they had an inceſtuous Perſon in their *Society*; and it ſeems he was of quality, and much accounted of, ſince they were puffed up with him: they were alſo a ſcandal to the Goſpel with their litigious Law ſutes. Theſe were great evils, and I hope beyond what you can charge on us: and yet though the Apoſtle commands them to be redreſſed, and rectified, doth he ever allow of theſe in *Corinth*, who were pure and holy, to forſake the *ſolemn Aſſemblies*, till theſe things were amended? Or doth he not highly commend *Charity* and *Unity* to them? Next, conſider what Teachers theſe were who *preached CHRIST of envy and ſtrife, out of contention, and not ſincerely, that they might add affliction to the Apoſtles bonds*: And yet of theſe S. *Paul*'s verdict is, *What then? notwithſtanding every way, whether in pretence, or in truth, CHRIST is preached, and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.* Now if he rejoiced that *Chriſt* was preached at any rate, what Spirit have they, who becauſe they ſuppoſe ſome preach out of Envy, or deſign to add to their affliction, do thereupon ſtudy to blaſt their *reputation*, and to withdraw firſt the Hearts, and then the Ears of all from them? Certainly, this is not the Spirit of Chriſt

CHRIST, or of his Apoſtles. And though we ſee what corruptions had crept into the Churches of *Aſia*, yet in the *Epiſtles* to them in the *Revelation*, they are ſtill call'd the Churches of *GOD*, in the midſt of whom the Son of *GOD* walked. They are indeed commanded to reform any corruptions were among them; but ſuch as *had not that doctrine, and knew not the depths of Satan, but had kept their garments clean*, are not commanded to ſeparate from the reſt: on the contrary, *no other burden is laid upon them*; nor are they charged for not ſeparating from the reſt. From which premiſes I may infer, that as long as the *Communion of Saints* may be kept in, without our being polluted in ſome piece of ſinful concurrence, all are bound to it, under the hazard of tearing *Chriſt*'s Body to pieces. And this ſtands alſo with the cloſeſt Reaſon; for ſince *Unity* is that which holds all the body firm, whereas *diviſion* diſlocates and weakens it; nothing doth more defeat the ends of *Religion*, and overturn the power of *Godlineſs*, than *Sciſms* and *Contentions*; which give the greateſt offence to the little ones, and the fulleſt advantages to the common enemy imaginable. If therefore the Worſhip of *GOD* among us continue undefiled, even in the confeſſion of all; if the Sacraments be adminiſtred as before; if the Perſons that officiate be Miniſters of the

Goſpel, then certainly ſuch as ſeparate from our publick Meetings, do *forſake the Aſſemblies of the Saints, and ſo break the unity of the Spirit, and the bond of Peace.* And what you ſaid of a non-compliance as diſtinct from ſeparation, hath no relation to this purpoſe, where nothing of a compliance is in the caſe, but only a joining with the *Saints in ſolemn Worſhip.* And doth the change of the *Government of the Church*, in ſo ſmall a matter as the fixing a conſtant Preſident, with ſome *additions* of power over your *Synods*, in ſtead of your *ambulatory Moderators*, derive a Contagion into our Worſhip, ſo that without a Sin it cannot be joined in? Indeed if a Concurrence of Worſhip required an owning of every particular in the Conſtitution of the Church, a man muſt go to the *New Atlantis* to ſeek a *Society* he ſhall join with, ſince few of clear unprepoſſeſſed minds will find ſuch *Societies* in the known Regions of the World, againſt all whoſe Conſtitutions they have not ſome juſt exceptions: and the World ſhall have as many parties as perſons, if this be not fixed as the *rule of Unity*, that we cleave to it, ever till we be driven to do ſomewhat which with a good Conſcience we cannot yield to. And even in that caſe, except the corruption be great and deep, a bare withdrawing, without a direct oppoſition, is all we are bound to. You are therefore guilty of a direct ſeparation who

who forſake the *Aſſemblies of the Saints*, they continuing in their former purity, unchanged and unmixed, even in your own Principles.

Iſaac. But one thing is not conſidered by you, which is a main point, that we had our Church ſetled, according to CHRIST'S appointment, and ratified by Law. And a change of that being made, all our faithful Miniſters were turned out by the tyranny of the preſent Powers; who in ſtead thereof, have ſet up a new form of *Government*, of none of CHRIST'S appointment: and to maintain it, have thruſt in upon the *LORD*'s People, a company of weak, ignorant, ſcandalous and godleſs Men, called *Curates*; who in ſtead of edifying, ſtudy to deſtroy the flock: of whom I could ſay much, had I a little of your virulent temper: But their own actions have ſo painted them out to the world, that I may well ſpare my labor of making them better known, it being as unneceſſary as it is unpleaſant. Now if the true ſeekers of *GOD* do ſtill ſtick to their old Teachers, and ſeek wholſome food from them in corners, and are afraid of your falſe Teachers, according to *CHRIST*'s command, of being aware of ſuch men; call you this a *ſeparation*? which is rather an adherence to the true Church, and the *keeping of our Garments clean* from the contagion of theſe men. And indeed theſe who

do join with your *Curates*, do profit ſo little by their Miniſtry, that no wonder others have no heart to it. And I have known ſome whoſe *conſciences* are ſo tender in this matter, that their having at ſometimes joined with theſe *Curates* in Worſhip, hath been matter of mourning to them, even to their graves. And this may ſerve to clear us of the guilt of *Schiſm* in this matter, when our withdrawing is only a *non-compliance* with your corruption.

Phil. All this ſaith nothing for juſtifying your *ſeparation*. As for the turning out of your *Miniſters*, if the Laws to which their obedience was required were juſt (which ſhall be next conſidered) then their *prejudices, miſinformed conſciences, or peeviſhneſs*, and not the tyranny of the Rulers, muſt bear the blame of it. And for theſe ſet in their places, if upon ſo great a deſertion of the Church by ſo many Churchmen, all their charges could not be of a ſudden ſupplied with men ſo well qualified, or of ſuch gifts and worth as was to be deſired; it is nothing but what might have been expected upon ſuch an occaſion. And for your revilings, they well become the ſpirit which appears too viſibly in the reſt of your actings; but we ſtill ſtudy to bear theſe baſe and cruel reflections, with the patience becoming the *Miniſters of the Goſpel*, and of theſe who ſtudy to learn of him, *who when he*

he was reviled, reviled not again; but ſtood ſilent at thoſe unjuſt Tribunals, when he was falſly and blaſphemouſly reproached by his enemies; and therefore I ſhall leave anſwering of theſe fearful imputations you charge on our Clergy, to the great day of reckoning, wherein *judgment ſhall return to the righteous, and all the upright in heart ſhall follow it.* And in the mean while ſhall ſtudy *to bleſs when you curſe, and pray for you who do thus deſpitefully uſe us.* We truſt our witneſs is on high, that whatever defects cleave to us, and though, may be, we have not wanted a corrupt mixture (as you know among whom there was a ſon of Perdition) yet we are free of theſe things you charge on us promiſcuouſly, and that theſe imputations you charge us with, are as falſe as they are baſe. But all this will not ſerve the turn of many of your dividers, whoſe Miniſters continue with them as formerly, and meerly becauſe they hold themſelves bound in *Conſcience* to obey the Laws they are ſeparated from. Truly if you can clear this of *ſeparation*, you are a Maſter at ſubtil reaſoning. For you know it is not the third part of this Church which was abandoned by the former Miniſters upon the late change, and yet the humor of *ſeparating* is univerſal. And though ſome few of your own Miniſters have had the honeſt zeal to witneſs againſt this *ſeparation*, yet how have they

they being pelted for it by the censures and writings of other *Schismaticks*? which have prevailed so much upon the fear or prudence of others, that whatever mislike they had of these *separating practices*, yet they were willing either to comply in practice, or to be silent *spectators* of so great an evil. But if *separation* be a Sin, it must have a guilt of a high nature, and such as all who would be thought zealous watch-men, ought to warn their people of. And what shall be said of these (even Church-men) who at a time when the Laws are sharply looked to, do join in our Worship; but if there be an unbending in these, they not only withdraw, and become thereby a scandal to others, but draw about them divided Meetings; are not these time-servers? For if concurrence in our Worship be lawful, and to be done at any time, it must be a duty which should be done at all times: and therefore such *Masters of Conscience* ought to express an equality in their ways, and that they make the rules of their *concurrence in worship*, to be the Laws of GOD, and not the fear of civil punishments. Finally, such as think it lawful to join in our Worship, and yet that they may not displease the people, do withdraw, shew they prefer the pleasing of men to the pleasing of GOD: and that they make more account of the one than of the other. For if it be lawful to *concur in our worship*, what

what was formerly ſaid, proves it a duty: Are not theſe then the ſervants of men, who to pleaſe them, diſpenſe with what by their own conceſſion muſt be a duty? Beſides, ſuch perſons withdrawing, gives a great and real ſcandal to the vulgar, who are led by their Example, and ſo a humor of *ſeparating* comes to be derived into all: whereby every one thinks it a piece of Religion, and that which will be ſure to make him conſiderable, and bring cuſtomers to him, if he be a Merchant or Trades-man, that he deſpiſe the ſolemn Worſhip, and rail at his Miniſter: and if he but go to Conventicles, and be concern'd in all the humors of the Party, he is ſure of a good name, be he as to other things what he will.

Eud. Much of this we know to be too true: and certainly, nothing deſerves more blame for all the diſorders are among us than this ſeparation. Diſcipline goes down, Catechiſing is deſpiſed, the Sacraments are loathed, the ſolemn Worſhip deſerted. I know the poor *Curates* bear the blame of all, and all of them muſt be equally condemned, if a few of them have miſcarried; for which when ever it was proved, they were cenſured condignly: In end, you charge their gifts, and that their People are not edified by them: But I pray you, ſee whether the prejudices you make them drink in againſt

against them, occasion not that. For it is a more than humane work, to overcome prejudices. Read but the complaints of the Prophets, and you will confess a Churchmans not being profitable to his People, will be no good argument to prove him not sent of *GOD*, And when I consider, that even the Apostles call for the help of the Churches Prayers, *that utterance might be given to them*, yea and *desire them to strive together in their Prayers for them*; I must crave leave to tell you, that the defect of that utterance, and power in preaching you charge on the present Preachers, may be well imputed to the want of the concurrence of the Peoples Prayers, whom prepossessions have kept from striving together with them in Prayer, that they might come among them *with the fulness of the blessing of the Gospel*. And if there be any of such tender and milled Consciences, who have been smitten with remorse for such concurrence in Worship, as their tenderness is to be valued, so their ignorance is to be pitied: and they who thus misled them, deserve the heavier censure, since they have involved simple and weak Consciences with their pedling Sophistry into such straits and doubts. In fine, you cannot say, that a Minister is by a Divine right placed over any particular flock. If then it be humane, it with all other things of that nature, is within the

the Magiſtrates cognizance; ſo that when he removes one, and leaves a legal way patent for bringing in another, upon which there comes one to be placed over that flock, what injuſtice ſoever you can fancy in ſuch dealing, yet certainly, it will never free that Pariſh from the tie of aſſociating in the publick Worſhip, or receiving the Sacraments from the hands of that Miniſter, whom they cannot deny to be a Miniſter of the Goſpel: and therefore no irregularity in the way of his entry, though as great as can be imagined, will warrant the peoples ſeparating from him. Neither can they pretend that the firſt Incumbent is ſtill their Miniſter, for his relation to them being founded meerly on the Laws of the Church, it is (as was proved in the Second Conference) ſubject to the Magiſtrates authority, and ſo laſts no longer than he ſhall diſſolve it by his commands: unleſs it appear, that he deſigns the overthrow of true Religion; in which caſe, I confeſs Paſtors are, according to the practice of the firſt Ages of the Church, to continue at the hazard of all perſecutions, and feed their flocks. But this is not applicable to our Caſe, where all that concerns Religion continues as formerly: only ſome combinations made in prejudice of the Supreme Authority are broken: and order is reſtored to the Church, inſtead of the confuſions and diviſions

ſions were formerly in it. And if this change have occaſioned greater diſorders, wherever the defect of Policy or Prudence may be charged, yet certainly, if the change that is made, be found of its own nature both lawful and good, the confuſions have followed upon it, are their guilt, who with ſo little reaſon, and ſo much eagerneſs, have not only refuſed obedience themſelves, but hindered ſuch as were willing to have yielded it.

Crit. Indeed this point of withdrawing from the publick worſhip, for their faultineſs who officiate, or for the errors are ſuppoſed to be in the way of their entry, doth ſo contradict the whole ſeries of the Sacred Rule, that nothing can be more expreſly condemned in it. The Sons of *Eli* made the People abhor the offering, and they defiled the Tabernacle of *GOD*; yet for all that, the people continued to come and offer their Sacrifices. The Prophets do alſo tell us what kind of People the Prieſts in their times were, and yet never a word of the peoples withdrawing from the Worſhip. Now this muſt by the parity of reaſon, hold good under the *New Diſpenſation*; except you ſay, we are not ſo much obliged to worſhip *GOD* in the unity of the Spirit, as they were; the contrary whereof will be found true. Next, the *High Prieſthood* being entailed on the line of *Aaron*,

was

was certainly to deſcend (as all other rights did among the *Jews*) by the right of repreſentation and primogeniture; and ſo did *Eleazer* and *Phinehas* follow in a line from *Aaron*. It is true, the *High Prieſthood* was afterwards in *Ithamar*'s line, but it doth not appear by what conveyance it went to them, which certainly muſt have been Divine, if lawful: And none can limit GOD from diſpenſing with his own poſitive Laws. But the *High Prieſthood* was again ſet in its own channel by *David*, and ſo continued downward, till after the ſecond Temple, it becoming the chief Secular Power, was expoſed to ſale: and this appears from a paſſage cited by *Doctor Lightfoot* out of the *Talmud* of *Jeruſalem*, *in the firſt Temple the High Prieſts ſtill ſerved, the Son ſucceeding the Father, and they were* 18 *in number: but in the ſecond Temple they got the High Prieſthood by money. And ſome ſay, they deſtroyed one another by witchcraft: ſo that ſome ſay, there were* 80 *Prieſts in that ſpace; ſome* 81, *ſome* 82, *ſome* 83, *ſome* 84, *and ſome* 85. And that Learned *Doctor* reckons 53 in order, till he brings the Succeſſion down to the time of the Wars, after which it was ſo confuſed, that he purſues it no further. And in the beginning of the 3 *chap. of his Temple-ſervice*, he proves the High Prieſthood to have deſcended to the firſt-born, as the Prieſthood, before the Law, belonged to the

firſt

first-born of every Family. And therefore it was that when *Simeon the Just* would have put *Onias* his second Son in the Priesthood, he could not do it. But *Simeon* the eldest Brother obtained his right, and *Onias* was put to fly to *Egypt*, where he built a famous Temple. This will prove that the High Priests in our Saviour's time had no just title to their office; and yet our Saviour, being by his humiliation in the character of a private Person, never questioned it, no not when he was upbraided, as if he had answered *GOD*'s High Priest irreverently, which looks like a case of Confession. And S. *Paul* did the same. Now as to what is said of the High Priests being a Civil Magistrate, it will not serve to deliver you; for his title to the Civil Power flowed from his office: therefore the owning him in that, did also acknowledge his office, since he had no other right to the Civil Power, but because he was High Priest, and yet subjection was given him by our *LORD*, who acknowledged the High Priest. Did he not also continue in the Temple Worship, and go thither on their festivities? where you know he must have offered Sacrifices by the hands of these Priests: and yet we know well enough what a sort of People they were. If then we are no less bound under the Gospel to the rules of Order and Unity, than they were under the Law,

Law, it will follow that no perſonal corruption of Church-men, can warrant a ſeparation from Worſhip, even though their Opinions were erroneous, and their practices naughty: for the impertinency of the diſtinction of *Non-compliance* and *ſeparation* was already proved. But next to the Temple-worſhip, was the ſervice of the *Synagogue*, which was for the moſt part in the hands of the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, who expounded the Law to the people: And *Chriſt*'s commanding the people *to obſerve what they taught*, ſhews clearly his pleaſure was, that they ſhould not forſake the *Synagogues* where they taught: And his own going to the *Synagogues*, in which it is not to be doubted but he concurred in the *Prayers* and *Hymns*, proves abundantly that their Worſhip was not to be ſeparated from. As for your Friends involved diſcourſe, about the declining of Churches, *Pag.* 193. I muſt let it alone, till I can make ſenſe of it: For if he intend to compare our *Lord* and his Apoſtles, their joining in the *Jewiſh Worſhip*, with the miſguided, though ſincere devotion, of ſome holy Souls who worſhipped *God* with all the corruptions of the *Roman Church*, I hope he will repent the blaſphemy of ſuch a miſtake. And as for what is alledged, *Pag.* 198. that the *Jewiſh Diſpenſation* being mixed, and their Law made up of *matters Political*, as well as

Spiritual, therefore these *Scribes* were the Oracles of the *Civil Law*, and so to be gone to, it is as weak as the rest: For the Law being to be *sought from the Priests lips*, as to all the parts of it, any power the Priests had of pronouncing about the questions of the Law, was because they were Priests, or as they were men separated for officiating in the *Synagogues*: so the receiving their decisions in *matters judicial*, did acknowledg their Office, which was purely *Ecclesiastical and sacred*.

From all this I may infer, that as long as any *Society* continues to be the Church and people of *GOD*, and hath the service and worship of *GOD* performed in it by men solemnly separated, according to *GOD*'s appointment, whatever irregularities be either in their entry to such charges, or of their opinions or practices, these should indeed be cognosced upon, and censured by the *Supreme Powers in the Society*; but will never warrant private persons to separate from the Worship, unless it be so vitiated in any part of it, that without sin they cannot concur in it: in which case, they are indeed to keep themselves clean, and to withdraw, but not to divide until the Worship be so corrupted, that the ends of publick Worship can no more be answered by such *Assemblies*.

Poly. I know it is thought a piece of noble gallan-

gallantry among our new modelled people, to deſpiſe the ſentiments of the *Ancient Church*; and therefore whatever I could adduce from them, would prevail little for their conviction: otherwiſe many things could be brought to this purpoſe from theſe two great Aſſertors of the Unity of the Church againſt Schiſms and Diviſions, S. *Cyprian*, and S. *Auguſtin*: the latter eſpecially, who by many large Treatiſes ſtudied the conviction of the *Donatiſts*, who maintained their ſeparation from the Church, much upon the ſame grounds which are by your Friends aſſerted. But I ſhall diſmiſs this point with one Sentence of S. *Auguſtin*, *lib.* 2. *contra Parmen.* *Quiſquis ergo vel quod poteſt arguendo corrigit; vel quod corrigere non poteſt, ſalvo pacis vinculo excludit, vel quod ſalvo pacis vinculo excludere non poteſt, æquitate improbat, firmitate ſupportat, hic eſt pacificus.* And let me freely tell you, that when I conſider the temper, the untractableneſs, the peeviſh complainings, the railings, the high cantings of the *Donatiſts*, which are ſet down by him, and others, I am ſometimes made to think I am reading things that are now among our ſelves, and not what paſſed twelve Ages ago. And indeed ſome late practices make the parallel run more exactly betwixt our modern Zealots and the *Circumcellions*, who were a Sect of the *Donatiſts*, that was acted by a black and a

moſt deſperate ſpirit. For St. *Auguſtin* tells us, how they fell on theſe who adhered to the *Unity of the Church*, beating ſome with Cudgels, putting out the Eyes of others, and invading the lives of ſome, particularly of *Maximinus* Biſhop of *Hagaia*, whom they left ſeveral times for dead. And what inſtances of this nature theſe few years have produced, all the Nation knows. How many of the Miniſters have been invaded in their Houſes, their Houſes rifled, their goods carried away, themſelves cruelly beaten and wounded, and often made to ſwear to abandon their Churches, and that they ſhould not ſo much as complain of ſuch bad uſage to theſe in Authority: their Wives alſo ſcaped not the fury of theſe accurſed Zealots, but were beaten and wounded, ſome of them being ſcarce recovered out of their labor in Child-birth. Believe me, theſe barbarous outrages have been ſuch, that worſe could not have been apprehended from *Heathens*. And if after theſe, I ſhould recount the Railings, Scoffings and floutings which the *Conformable Miniſters* meet with to their Faces, even on ſtreets, and publick High-ways, not to mention the contempt is poured on them more privately, I would be looked on as a forger of extravagant Stories. But it is well I am talking to men who know them as well as my ſelf. From theſe things I may well aſſume that the perſecution

cution lies mainly on the *Conformists* side, who for their Obedience to the Laws, lie thus open to the fury of their Enemies.

Isot. Now, I dare say, you speak against your conscience: For do you think any of the *LORD*'s people have accession to so much wickedness, which is abhorred by them all: and this is well enough known to you, though you seem to disguise it. For you have often heard our honest Ministers express their horror at such practices; do not therefore *sin against the generation of the Lord's Children* so far, as to charge the guilt of some murdering Rogues, upon these who would be very glad to see Justice done upon such Villains.

Phil. You say very fair, and I am glad to hear you condemning these Crimes so directly: and I am as desirous as any living can be, to be furnished with clear evidences of believing as much good as is possible of all mankind. But let me tell you plainly, that the constant concealing of these murderers, whom no search which those in Authority have caused to make, could discover, tho the Robbers carried with them often a great deal of furniture, and other goods, which must have been conveyed to some adjacent Houses, but could never be found out, after so many repeated facts of that nature, forceth upon the most charitable, a suspicion which I

love not to name. Next, let me tell you that theſe things are very juſtifiable from the principles your Friends go upon: for if we be by Oath bound to diſcover all Malignants or evil inſtruments, that they may be brought to condign puniſhment; and if our *Conformity* be ſo notorious a wickedneſs, and ſuch a plain breach of Covenant, in the puniſhment whereof the Magiſtrate is ſupine and backward, then let every one compare the doctrine of the late Pamphlets, *from p.* 282. *to p.* 408. *chiefly* 404. *and* 405. and declare whether by the Rules laid down in them, any private perſons upon heroical excitations may not execute vengeance on theſe who are ſo guilty of groſs and notorious backſliding and defection: and what may not be expected of this nature from him *who heſitates to call the invading of the Biſhop with a Piſtol, an accurſed act*; and will only condemn it, *as raſh, precipitant*; *and of evil example*: and that not ſimply neither, *but all circumſtances being conſidered, and their exigences duly ballanced*? Which makes me apprehend his greateſt quarrel with that deed was; that it miſſed the deſigned effect, and ſo was done inadvertently, or too publickly, or upon ſome ſuch particular ground, which may have occaſioned its miſcarriage. But to deal roundly with you, I ſhall freely acknowledg, if the Doctrine of Reſiſtance by private Subjects againſt theſe in Authority

Authority be lawful, I ſee no ground to condemn ſuch practices: For if we may riſe in Arms againſt thoſe in Authority over us, and coerce and puniſh them; why not much rather againſt our fellow Subjects, and thoſe to whom we owe no obedience, eſpecially when we judg them to have tranſgreſſed ſo ſignally, and to have injured us to a high degree? which is the caſe, as moſt of you ſtate it, with the Miniſters that are conformable. And from this, let me take the freedom to tell you, that the whole *Myſtery of Jeſuitiſm* doth not diſcover a principle more deſtructive of the peace and order of mankind, than this doctrine of the lawfulneſs of private perſons executing vengeance on groſs offenders, where the tranſgreſſion is judged ſignal, the Magiſtrate is judged remiſs, and the actors pretend an heroick excitation. This puts a Sword in a mad mans hands, and arms the whole multitude, and is worſe than theirs, who will have ſuch deeds warranted by ſome ſupreme *Eccleſiaſtical Power*, or at leaſt by a *Confeſſarius* and *Director* of the *Conſcience*. Indeed this may juſtly poſſeſs the minds of all that hear it with horror, it being a direct contradiction of the *Moral Law*, and an overturning of all the *Societies* of Mankind, and Laws of Nature.

Eud. I am more charitable than you are: for though I muſt acknowledg what you have

alledged to be the native conſequence of what is aſſerted in that Book, yet I am inclined to believe he intended not theſe things ſhould be drawn from it, ſince he in plain terms, *pag.* 402. condemns theſe outrages. I confeſs, his zeal to defend all *Naphthali* ſaid, and to refute every thing the *Confermiſt* alledged, hath engaged him further than himſelf could upon ſecond thoughts allow of. And as for the inſtances of *Phinehas*, *Elijah*, or other Prophets, the argument from them was ſo fully obviated in our *Firſt Conference*, that I am confident little weight will be laid upon it. But now, methinks, it is more than time we conſidered the importance of that difference about which all this ado is made: for one would expect it muſt be a very concerning matter, which hath occaſioned ſo much bloud and confuſion, and continues ſtill to divide us aſunder, with ſo much heat and bitterneſs. I confeſs, my diſcerning is weak, which keeps me from apprehending what importance can be in it to exact ſo much zeal for it, that it ſhould be called the *Kingdom of CHRIST upon Earth, his Intereſt, Cauſe, and Work*, which therefore ſhould be earneſtly contended for.

Jot. *The natural man receiveth not the things of GOD, and they are fooliſhneſs to him: but Wiſdom is juſtified of all her children.* That we plead for,

is

is *CHRIST's Kingdom*, which is in oppoſition both to the proud aſpirings of the *Prelates*, and to the violent invaſions of the *Civil Powers*: We are therefore on *CHRIST's* ſide, aſſerting that none in earth can inſtitute new Officers in his Houſe, but thoſe he hath appointed: and that he hath appointed none higher than ordinary preaching *Presbyters*, among whom he will have an equality obſerved: which whoſoever contradict, with *Diotrephes*, *they love the preeminence*, and *Lord it over GOD's inheritance.*

Phil. Though I will not fly ſo high with my pretenſions in big words, yet the iſſue of our Diſcourſe will declare if I have not better grounds to aſſert *Epiſcopacy* to have deſcended from the Apoſtles, and Apoſtolical times, into all the Ages and corners of the Church who received it: and that there is nothing in Scripture that contradicts ſuch an *Inſtitution*. But I ſhall refer the deciſion of this to all impartial minds.

Baſil. Truly, when without a particular Examen, I conſider the whole matter in general, I can ſee little to except againſt *Epiſcopal Government*, that I cannot avoid the ſevere thoughts of ſuſpecting the great averſion many have at it, to be occaſioned from the *ſpirit of contradiction* is in many *which luſteth to envy*, or from their oppoſition to thoſe in Authority: For I doubt not but

but if *Presbytery* had the ſame countenance from the Laws, it ſhould meet with the ſame contradiction from theſe who ſeem to adhere to no principle ſo firmly, as to their *reſiſting the Powers that are ordained of* GOD. But the handling of this, with that fulneſs and clearneſs which the noiſe made about it requires, will take up more of our time than we can be now Maſters of, and may well claim a new *Conference*: Therefore we ſhall remit any further diſcourſe about it to our next meeting.

Iſot. It is agreed to: and I ſhall let you ſee, that for all the Railings of theſe days Diſcourſe, my patience is yet ſtrong enough to allow of another enterview, though I confeſs my ſelf weary of ſo much bad Company, whoſe evil Communications are deſigned to corrupt my good Principles.

Phil. I confeſs, my wearineſs is as great as yours, though upon a very different account: For I am ſurfeited of the Contention and heat hath been among us, and long for an end of our *Conferences* upon theſe Heads, which I ſhall now go through once for all, being encouraged to meet with you again, becauſe this penance is near an end: out of which if I were once extricated, I am reſolved to meddle in ſuch contentious Themes no more.

Eud.

Eud. Having ſwallowed the Ox, we muſt not ſtick on the Rump. It is true, your Converſe is extreamly agreeable, yet my ſtomach begins to turn at ſo much diſputing: But, I hope, to morrow ſhall put an end to it: And therefore I doubt not of your return, to finiſh what you hitherto carried on. And ſo a good night to you.

THE

THE FOURTH CONFERENCE.

Iſotimus.

I COME now upon our laſt Nights appointment, to purſue this *Conference* to its end, and to examine what theſe grounds are which endear *Epiſcopacy* to you ſo much, eſpecially conſidering the great diſorders and confuſions its re-eſtabliſhment among us hath occaſioned. For my part, I cannot ſee what can reconcile the World to it, much leſs what ſhould enamour you ſo of it, as to make you adhere to it, notwithſtanding all the evils ſpring from it, and all theſe black Characters of *GOD*'s diſpleaſure are upon it: which really appear ſo ſignally to me, that it ſeems a fighting againſt *GOD*, to adhere longer to it.

Phil. Truly, you and I enter on this Subject with an equal ſurprize, though upon very differ-

different accounts: For I must tell you freely, that after I have with all the application of mind, and freedom of thoughts imaginable, considered what could engage so many in this *Island*, into so much zeal and rage against the Order, I am not able to satisfie my self about it. That venerable Order having such a native tendency for advancing of true Religion, Peace, Order, and every thing that is excellent: that the aversion and prejudices so many have drunk in against it, seem as unjust, as unconquerable, and look like a part of *GOD*'s controversie with us; whereby we are blindly carried into so much unjustifiable zeal against that, which if well managed, might prove an excellent mean for reviving the power of Religion, that hath suffered so great decays. I shall not deny, but on our part there have been great failings, for which *GOD*'s anger hangs over our heads: and that he permits all this opposition we meet with for punishing us for our sins, which have justly provoked *GOD* to make us *base and contemptible in the sight of the people.* And this I hope shall be an effectual mean of humbling us, and of purging us from our dross: whereby this holy Order being again managed with the ancient Spirit, may appear into the World in its *Primitive lustre*; and be attended with the blessings that then followed it, to the wonder

wonder and conviction of all men. But let me add, the oppoſition ſome firy ſpirits have given the eſtabliſhment of *Epiſcopacy*, deſerves much of the blame of its being ſo little ſucceſful in the great work of the Goſpel: for always *bitter envy and ſtrife* produce *confuſion and every evil work*: therefore when you are to view *Epiſcopacy* in its amiable and lovely colors, let me ſend you back to that *cloud of witneſſes*, who for the *teſtimony of* JESUS endured all manner of torments, were torn by beaſts, ſlain by the ſword, burnt in the fire; and in a word, who preached the everlaſting Goſpel through the World. How many Churches did theſe Biſhops found with their labors in preaching, and water not only with their tears, but their blood? how ſublime was their piety? how frevent were their Sermons? how conſtant were their labors? how ſtrict was their diſcipline? how zealous were they againſt hereſies? and how watchful againſt vice? In a word, read but the Hiſtories and Writings of thoſe *great Worthies*, who were by the confeſſion of all men, *Biſhops*, and had more abſolute Authority over the *Inferior Clergy*, than is pretended to among us? and then tell me, if you have not changed your verdict of that order. Have there been ſuch men in the Chriſtian World, as were *Ignatius*, *Polycarp*, *Irenæus*, *Cyprian*, *Thaumaturg*, *Athanaſius*, *Baſil*,

Baſil, *Nazianzen*, *Martin*, *Ambroſe*, *Chryſoſtome*, *Auguſtin*, *and a thouſand more*? Theſe were, after the Apoſtles, the greateſt glories of the Chriſtian Church: and were *burning and ſhining lights*. It is in their lives, writings and decrees, that I deſire you to view Epiſcopacy: and if it have any way fallen from that firſt and fair Original, direct your thoughts and zeal to contrive and carry on its recovery to its former purity and fervor: but take it not at the diſadvantage, as it may have ſuffered any thing from the corruptions of men, in a ſucceſſion of ſo many ages; for you know the Sacraments, the Miniſtery, and all the parts of Religion have been ſoiled, and ſtained of their firſt beauty by their corrupt hands, to whoſe care they were committed. But he were very much to blame, who would thereupon quarrel theſe things. I ſhall therefore intreat you will conſider that Order, either in it ſelf, or as it flouriſhed in the firſt ages of the Church, and not as prejudices or particular eſcapes may have repreſented it to you.

Eud. That you may both underſtand one another better, let me ſuggeſt to you the right ſtating of that you differ about, that you be not contending about words, or notions of things, which may appear with various ſhapes, and faces; one whereof may be amiable, and another ugly

ugly: give therefore a clear and distinct account of that *Episcopacy* you own and assert.

Poly. Since *Philarchus* hath appealed to the ancient Church, for the true pattern of *Episcopacy*, I shall faithfully represent to you, what the office and power of their Bishops was, and how it took its first rise and growth among them; and then I shall leave it to be discussed, how lawful or allowable it is of it self. The *Jews* had among them, beside the *Temple-worship*, which was *Typical*, their *Synagogues*, not only over the land, but through all the corners of the World into which they were dispersed; which were called their *Proseuchæ* among the *Greeks*, and *Romans*. Thither did they meet for the dayly worship of *GOD*; there did they likewise meet on their Sabbaths, and recited their *Philacteries*, or *Liturgies*, and heard a portion of the Law read: which was divided in so many Sections, that it might be yearly read over: there was also a word of exhortation used, after the Law was read: and there were in these Synagogues, Office-Bearers separated for that work, who were to order the Worship, and the reading of the Law, and were to censure sins, by several degrees of *Excommunications*, casting them out of the *Synagogue*: they were likewise to see to the supplying the necessities of the Poor. Now if we consider the practice of our

Saviour

Saviour, and his Apoſtles, we ſhall find them ſtudying to comply with the forms received among the *Jews*, as much as was poſſible, or conſiſtent with the new Diſpenſation; which might be inſtanced in many particulars, as in both Sacraments, the forms of Worſhip, the practice of Excommunication, and theſe might be branched out into many inſtances. And indeed ſince we find the Apoſtles yielding ſo far in compliance with the *Jews* about the *Moſaical Rites*, which were purely typical, and conſequently antiquated by the death of *CHRIST*, we have a great deal of more reaſon to apprehend they complied with their forms in things that were not typical, but rather moral, ſuch as was the order of their Worſhip: theſe things only excepted, wherein the Chriſtian Religion required a change to be made: And this the rather, that wherever they went promulgating the Goſpel, the firſt offer of it was made to the *Jews*; many of whom believed, but were ſtill *zealous of the Traditions of their Fathers.* And ſo it is not like, that they who could not be prevailed upon to part with the *Moſaical Rites*, for all the reaſons were offered againſt them, were ſo eaſily content to change their other forms, which were of themſelves uſeful and innocent. Now ſince we ſee the Apoſtles retained, and improved ſo many of their Rites and

cuſtoms, why they ſhould have innovated the Government of their Synagogues, will not be eaſily made clear: eſpecially ſince they retained the names of *Biſhop*, *Presbyter*, and *Deacon*, which were in uſe among the *Jews*, and ſince they did bleſs and ſeparate them by the impoſition of hands, which had been alſo practiſed among the *Jews*: and all this will appear with a clearer viſage of reaſon, if we conſider the accounts given in the *Acts*, or rules preſcribed in the *Epiſtles of the Apoſtles*, about the framing and conſtituting their Churches. All which ſpeak out nothing of a new Conſtitution, but tell only what rules they gave for regulating things; which from the ſtile they run in, ſeem to have been then conſtituted: and is very far either from *Moſes*'s Language in the *Pentateuch*, or from the forms of the Inſtitution of the Sacraments: And except the little we have of the Inſtitution of Deacons, nothing like an Inſtitution occurs in the *New Teſtament*; and yet that ſeems not the Inſtitution of an Order, but a particular proviſion of men for ſerving the *Helleniſts* in an office already known, and received. Now let me here ſend you to the Maſters of the *Jewiſh* learning, particularly to the eminently learned, and judicious *Doctor Lightfoot*, who will inform you, that in every Synagogue there was one peculiarly charged with the Worſhip

ſhip, called the *Biſhop of the Congregation, the Angel of the Church, or the Miniſter of the Synagogue*: and beſides him, there were three, who had the Civil Judicatory; who judged alſo about the receiving Proſelytes, the impoſition of hands, *&c.* And there were other three, who gathered, and diſtributed the almes. Now the Chriſtian Religion taking place, as the Goſpel was planted in the Cities, where it was chiefly preached, theſe forms and orders were retained, both name and thing: for we cannot think that the Apoſtles, whoſe chief work was the gaining of Souls from *Gentiliſm* or *Judaiſm*, were very ſollicitous about modes of Government; but took things as they found them. Only the Elder and greater Chriſtians they ſeparated for Church Offices, and retained an inſpection over them themſelves. And abſtracting from what was ſaid about the *Synagogues*, it is natural to think, that when the Apoſtles left them, and died, they did appoint the more eminent to be Over-ſeers to the reſt; which why not every where, as well as was done by S. *Paul* to *Timothy* and *Titus*, is not eaſily to be proved. But this is yet more rational from what was premiſed about the *Synagogue* Pattern; only they did not reſtrict themſelves to that number, for the number of the *Presbyters* was indefinite; but the *Deacons* were accord-

ing to their first original, restricted to the number seven. Thus the first form was, that there was one whose charge it was to over-see, feed, and rule the flock: and where the number of the Christians was small, they met all in one place for Worship, and it was easie for the *Bishop* to overtake the charge. But for the spreading of the Gospel, he had about him a company of the elder, and more eminent Christians, who were designed and ordained for diffusing the *Gospel* through the Cities, Villages, and Places adjacent: and these *Presbyters* were as the Bishop's Children educated, and formed by him, being in all they did, directed by him, and accountable to him, and were as Probationers for the Bishoprick: one of them being always chosen to succeed in the seat when vacant through the Bishop's death. Now all these lived together, as in a little *College*, and were maintained out of the charitable Oblations of the People, which were deposited in the Bishop's hands, and divided in four parts; one falling to the Bishop, another to the Clergy, a third to the Widows and Orphans, and other poor Persons, and a fourth to the building of edifices for Worship. Thus the Churches were planted, and the *Gospel* was disseminated through the World. But at first every Bishop had but one Parish, yet afterwards when the numbers of the Christians encrea-

encreaſed, that they could not conveniently meet in one place; and when through the violence of the Perſecutions they durſt not aſſemble in great multitudes, the Biſhops divided their charges in leſſer Pariſhes, and gave aſſignments to the *Presbyters* of particular flocks, which was done firſt in *Rome*, in the beginning of the Second *Century*: and theſe Churches aſſigned to *Presbyters*, as they received the Goſpel from the Biſhop, ſo they owned a dependence on him as their Father, who was alſo making frequent excurſions to them, and viſiting the whole bounds of his Precinct. And things continued thus in a *Parochial Government*, till toward the end of the Second *Century*, the Biſhop being chiefly entruſted with the cure of Souls, a ſhare whereof was alſo committed to the *Presbyters*, who were ſubject to him, and particularly were to be ordained by him; nor could any Ordination be without the Biſhop; who in ordaining, was to carry along with him the concurrence of the *Presbyters*, as in every other act of *Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction*. But I run not out into more particulars, becauſe of an account of all theſe things which I have drawn with an unbiaſs'd ingenuity, and as much diligence as was poſſible for me to bring along with me to ſo laborious a work: and this I ſhall ſend you when our *Conference* ſhall be at an end. But in the end of the Second

Century, the Churches were framed in another mould from the diviſion of the *Empire*: and the *Biſhops* of the Cities did, according to the ſeveral diviſions of the *Empire*, aſſociate in *Synods* with the chief *Biſhop* of that *Diviſion* or *Province*, who was called the *Metropolitan*, from the dignity of the City where he was *Biſhop*. And hence ſprang *Provincial Synods*, and the *Superiorities*, and *Precedencies* of *Biſhopricks*, which were ratified in the Council of *Nice*, as ancient *Cuſtoms*, they being at that time above an hundred years old. In the beginning of the Third *Century*, as the purity of Churchmen begun to abate, ſo new methods were deviſed for preparing them well to thoſe ſacred Functions, and therefore they were appointed to paſs through ſeveral degrees before they could be *Deacons*, *Presbyters*, or *Biſhops*. And the Orders of *Porters*, *Readers*, *Singers*, *Exorciſts* (or *Catechiſts*) *Acolyths* (who were to be the *Biſhops* attendants) and *Subdeacons*, were ſet up; of whom mention is made firſt by *Cyprian*: and theſe degrees were ſo many ſteps of probationerſhip to the ſupreme Order. But all this was not able to keep out the corruptions were breaking in upon Church Officers, eſpecially after the Fourth *Century*, that the *Empire* became Chriſtian: which as it brought much riches and ſplendor on Church Employments, ſo it let in great ſwarms of cor-

corrupt men on the Chriſtian Aſſemblies: And then the election to Church Offices, which was formerly in the hands of the people, was taken from them, by reaſon of the tumults and diſorders were in theſe elections: which ſometimes ended in blood, and occaſioned much faction, and ſchiſm. And *Ambitus* became now ſuch an univerſal ſin among Churchmen, that in that *Century*, *Monaſteries* were founded in divers places by holy Biſhops, as by *Baſile*, *Auguſtine*, *Martin*, and others; who imitated the Example of thoſe in *Egypt*, and *Nitria*; whoſe deſign was the purifying of theſe who were to ſerve in the Goſpel. It is true, theſe Seminaries did alſo degenerate, and become neſts of ſuperſtition and idleneſs: yet it cannot be denied, but this was an excellent Conſtitution, for rightly forming the minds of the deſigners for holy Orders; that being trained up in a courſe of Devotion, Faſting, Solitude, abſtraction from the World, and Poverty, they might be better qualified for the diſcharge of that holy Function. And thus I have given you a general draught and perſpective of the firſt Conſtitution of Churches, together with ſome ſteps of their advances, and declinings: But I deſpair not to give you an ampler account, and plan of their rules and forms. Mean while, let this ſuffice.

Phil. From what you have told us, I ſhall propoſe the notion I have of *Epiſcopacy*, that the work of a *Biſhop*, as it is chiefly to feed the flock, ſo it is more particularly to form, educate, and try theſe who are to be admitted to *Church Imployments*; and to over-ſee, direct, admoniſh, and reprove theſe who are already ſetled in Church Offices: ſo that as the chief tryal of thoſe who are to be ordained, is his work, the Ordinations ought to be performed by him; yet not ſo as to exclude the aſſiſtance and concurrence of *Presbyters*, both in the previous tryal, and in the Ordination it ſelf. But on the other hand, no Ordination ought to be without the *Biſhop*. And as for Juriſdiction, though the *Biſhop* hath authority to over-ſee, reprove, and admoniſh the Clergy; yet in all acts of publick Juriſdiction, as he ought not to proceed without their concurrence, ſo neither ought they without his knowledge and allowance, determine about *Eccleſiaſtical matters*. As for the notion of the diſtinct Offices of *Biſhop* and *Presbyter*, I confeſs, it is not ſo clear to me: and therefore ſince I look upon the ſacramental Actions, as the higheſt of ſacred Performances; I cannot but acknowledge theſe who are empowered for them, muſt be of the higheſt Office in the Church. So I do not alledge a *Biſhop* to be a diſtinct Office from a *Presbyter*; but a different degree

degree in the ſame Office, to whom for order and unities ſake, the chief inſpection and care of *Eccleſiaſtical Matters* ought to be referred, and who ſhall have authority to curb the Inſolencies of ſome factious and turbulent Spirits. His work ſhould be to feed the flock by the Word and Sacraments, as well as other *Presbyters*; and eſpecially to try and ordain Entrants, and to over-ſee, direct, and admoniſh ſuch as bear Office. And I the more willingly incline to believe *Biſhops* and *Presbyters*, to be the ſeveral degrees of the ſame Office, ſince the names of *Biſhop* and *Presbyter*, are uſed for the ſame thing in Scripture; and are alſo uſed promiſcuouſly by the Writers of the two firſt *Centuries*. Now *Iſotimus*, when you bring either clear Scripture, or evident Reaſon, for proving this to be unlawful, or unexpedient, you ſhall ſhake my kindneſs to this Conſtitution, whoſe venerable Antiquity hath conciliated ſo much reverence from me to it, that it will be a great attempt to change my value of it.

Iſot. Theſe are all brave Stories well contrived for triumphing among ignorants. But theſe pretences from Antiquity have been ſo baffled by the learned Aſſertors of *Presbyterial Government*, that I wonder how you can ſo confidently vouch them, ſince there is not a veſtige of any diſparity before the 140th year after

Chriſt

CHRIST. And we know the *Myſtery of Iniquity* wrought in the days of the Apoſtles, and that then there was a *Diotrophes who loved the preeminence*, and the darkneſs and obſcurity of the riſe and progreſs of *Prelacy*, doth the more confirm me, that it was the *Myſtery of Iniquity*. The pretence from *Ignatius*'s Epiſtles, hath been often overthrown; and there are words in theſe Epiſtles which clearly prove them to be the contrivance of ſome Impoſtor, they being ſo inconſiſtent with the ſtrain of Religion, and truth of the Goſpel, not to ſpeak of the Orthodoxy and Piety of *Ignatius*, and the ſimplicity of theſe times, which demonſtrate their interpolation evidently, for all the pains *Doctor Hamond* hath been at to aſſert their faith: and therefore theſe can furniſh you with no argument. *See pag.* 145. *and* 151.

Poly. I confeſs I can hear you tell over the arguments of theſe Pamphlets with ſome patience: But truly in this inſtance, I know not how to treat you, or rather him in whoſe name you ſpeak, who yet would earneſtly perſwade the World of the great skill, he and his friends have in theſe things. Surely they are *the men of Wiſdom!* And one may as ſecurely pull the hairs out of a Lion's beard, as twit them with the leaſt degree of ignorance. But, pray, tell your *Learned Friend*, that in his next publick appear-

appearance, he meddle no more with Antiquity before he know it better, and discover not so much ignorance, that one of a months standing in that study may laugh at him.

Pray, *Sir*, are you in earnest, when you tell me that for 140 years after *CHRIST*, there is no vestige of Prelacy on record? Will you not believe *Irenæus*, who lived at that time, though he wrote some years after, and reckons the succession of the Bishops of *Rome* from the days of the Apostles? Or if the Writings and Records of that time be lost, will you give no credit in a Historical matter to those who followed that time, and drew their accounts from Writings then extant, though now lost, such as *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, but especially *Eusebius*, who gives the succession of the Bishops, in the several great Sees, from the Apostles days? Certainly, he who was born but about an hundred years after the time you mark, would have had some knowledge of so great a change. But if there was no vestige of *Prelacy* before the year 140 in which it first appeared, what time will you allow for its spreading through the World? Or was it in an instant received every where? Were all the pretenders so easily enflamed to this *Paroxism* of Ambition? And were all the other *Presbyters* so tame, as to be so easily wheedled out of their rights, without one protestation

on

on the contrary? How came the Eclipſe of the Church to a total Obſcuration in one minute? What charm was there in *Prelacy* at that time, that the World was ſo inchanted with it; and that ſo ſoon after S. *John*'s death, when *Polycarp*, and many more of the Apoſtolical men did yet ſurvive? And how came it, that all the Churches did ſo unanimouſly concur in the defection, and not ſo much as two witneſſes appeared to fight againſt this Beaſt? Let me tell you freely, there is not a ravery in *Don Quixot's Adventures*, or *Amadis de Gaul*, but is liker to prevail on my belief, than this *Romance*. But for *Ignatius*'s Epiſtles, the hazard of the iſſue of the debate about them is very unequal: for if theſe Epiſtles be his, then he dying ſo near S. *John*'s days, the Cauſe of *Presbytery* will be undone. But though they be not his, the Epiſcopal Party ſuſtain ſmall prejudice: For from other traces of Antiquity, it can be made as clear, that *Epiſcopacy* was in the Church from the days of the Apoſtles, as any hiſtorical thing which is at ſo great diſtance from our time. But for your friends exceptions at theſe Epiſtles, they betray his great skill, and tell clearly, that he underſtands not the queſtion, and that he hath never read a Page of *Doctor Hamond*, though with his uſual arrogance, he ſlights all he ſaith: For had he read any part of his diſſer-

diſſertation, he would have made a difference betwixt the old vulgar Edition of theſe Epiſtles, whoſe Interpolations that learned *Doctor* acknowledgeth, and the late Edition of them by the learned *Voſſius*, according to the *Medicean Codex*, whoſe authority he only voucheth. Now had he known this, would he have cited words out of them, which are not of the true Edition aſſerted by *Doctor Hamond*, but are of the old vulgar and rejected one? Certainly, had he read any thing of that debate, which hath been truly managed with much ſubtil critical learning on both ſides, he could not have ſtumbled unto ſuch a miſtake. But his reading, it is like, riſeth not above Pamphlets; and finding theſe words cited on the ſame deſign, before the late Editions of *Ignatius* came out; he, without examining, took them upon truſt from ſecond hand. But I ſhall not run out farther upon *Ignatius*'s Epiſtles, than to recommend their peruſal to you, and then I am confident you will diſcern ſuch a native, ſimple, and ſincerely pious, and devout ſtrain in them, ſo unlike the ſwelled Stile, or purpoſes of interpolated Writings, that they will be their own teſtimony for convincing you of their genuineneſs: but the exceptions againſt them being ſo fully, and ſo lately, with an amazing diligence, anſwered by *Doctor Pearſon*, I ſhall remit you to his Labors, if you intend

intend to examine this matter accurately.

Iſot. Your *Conformiſt* did likewiſe alledge the 40, but he ſhould have ſaid the 38 *Apoſtolical Canon*, with a hint, as if fifty of theſe might have been the Apoſtles appointments: though the heap of them is ſo full of novelties, that their Antiquity cannot be pleaded by any who knows the ſtate of the ancient Church; as appears from the 3, 17, and 25 Canons: and were theſe Canons received, they would prejudge more than advance the cauſe you maintain, as will appear from the 4, 33, 36, and 80 Canons, not to mention the 24, 26, 28, 41, 53, 57, and 75. And in a word, theſe Canons do only allow of a precedency of Order, but not of your Prelatick power and ſuperiority, that claims the ſole power of Ordination and Juriſdiction: *See pag.* 148.

Poly. Truly, Sir, if the former exceptions did prove your Author a ſecond hand writer, who voucheth Antiquity upon the teſtimony of others, this doth it much more. For I am ſure had he but read over thoſe Canons, which might be done in half an hour, he had argued this point at another rate: and had he ſeen the Edition of *Dionyſius Exiguus*, he had not accuſed the Conformiſt for citing that Canon, as the fortieth, ſince it is ſo in his diviſion, who was their firſt publiſher in the *Latine* Church, tho it be the thirty ninth in the *Greek* diviſion. But

I will deal roundly in this matter, and acknowledge that collection to be none of the Apoſtles nor *Clement*'s, ſince all that paſſed under *Clement*'s name was accounted ſpurious, except his firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*. Nor was this a production of the firſt two ages. For the ſilence of the Writers of thoſe *Centuries* gives clear evidence for their novelty: They not being cited for the deciſion of things then in controverſie, wherein they are expreſs, as in the matter of *Eaſter*, the *rebaptizing Hereticks*, and divers other particulars. Yet in the Fourth and Fifth *Century*, reference is after made to ſome Elders rules of the Church, which are to be found no where but in this Collection. The Apoſtolical Canons are alſo ſometimes expreſly mentioned: and this gives good ground to believe there were from the Third *Century* and forward, ſome rules general received in the Church, and held Apoſtolical, as being at firſt introduced by Apoſtolical men. This was at firſt learnedly made out by *De Marca Concord. lib.* 3. *c.* 2. and of late more fully by that moſt ingenious and accurate ſearcher into Antiquity *Beveregius* in his Preface to his *Annotations* on theſe Canons. Yet I am apt to think, they were only preſerv'd by an *oral tradition*: and that no collection of them was agreed on, and publiſh'd before the fifth *Century*. It is certain, the *Latine Church* in *Pope Inno-*

Innocent's days acknowledged no Canons but those of *Nice*. And many of the Canons in this Collection, we find among Canons of other Councils, particularly in that of *Antioch*; without any reference to a preceding authority that had enjoined them: which we can hardly think they had omitted, had they received the collection (I speak of) as Apostolical. And that of the *triple immersion in Baptism*, looks like a Rule, no elder than the *Arrian Controversie*. They began first to appear under the name of the Apostles Canons in the Fifth *Century*, which made *Pope Gelasius* with a Synod of seventy Bishops condemn them as Apocryphal; though I must add, that the authority of that pretended Council and Decree, though generally received, be on many accounts justly questionable: And yet by this we are only to understand, that he rejected that pretended authority of the Apostles prefixed to these Canons. In the beginning of the Sixth *Century* they were published by *Dionysius Exiguus*, who prefixed fifty of them to his translation of the *Greek Canons*; but he confesses they were much doubted by many. At the same time they were published in the *Greek Church* with the addition of thirty five more Canons, and were acknowledged generally. *Justinian* cites them often in the *Novels*, and in the sixth *Novel* calls them, the Canons

nons of the holy Apoſtles, kept and interpreted by the Fathers. And the ſame authority was aſcribed to them by the Council in *Trullo*. Theſe things had been pertinently alledged if you had known them, but for your Friends nibblings at them, if you will but give your ſelf the trouble of reading theſe Canons, you will be aſhamed of his weakneſs, who manageth his advantage ſo ill. And to inſtance this but in one particular, had he read theſe Canons himſelf, could he have cited the eighty which is among the latter additions, and paſſed by the ſixth, which is full to the ſame purpoſe? But for that impudent allegation,, as if a bare precedency had been only aſcribed to Biſhops by theſe Canons, look but on the 14 the 30. 37. 40. 54. and 73. and then paſs your verdict on your Friends ingenuity, or his knowledg. By the 14. *No Churchman may paſs from one Pariſh to another without his Biſhop's ſentence, otherwiſe he is ſuſpended from Eccleſiaſtical Functions: and if he refuſe to return, when required by his Biſhop, he is to be accounted a Churchman no more.* By the 30. *A Presbyter, who in contempt of his Biſhop gathers a Congregation apart, having nothing to condemn his Biſhop of, either as being unholy or unjuſt, he is to be depoſed, as one that is ambitious, and tyrannous; and ſuch of the Clergy or Laity as join with them, are likewiſe to be cenſured.* By the 37. *The Biſhop*

hath the care of all Church matters, which he muſt adminiſtrate as in the ſight of God. By the 39. *The Biſhop hath power over all the goods of the Church; and the reaſon given is, that ſince the precious ſouls of men are committed to him, it is much more juſt he have the charge of the goods of the Church.* By the 54. *If a Clergy-man reproach their Biſhop, he is to be depoſed, for it is written, Thou ſhalt not curſe the Ruler of thy people.* And by the 73. *A Biſhop, when accuſed, is only to be judged of by other Biſhops.* Now from theſe hints, judg whether there be truth in that Aſſertion, that only a precedency is aſſerted in theſe Canons: and if all the power is now pleaded for, be not there held out; not to mention the Canon was cited by the *Conformiſt*, that Presbyters or Deacons might finiſh nothing without the Biſhop's Sentence, ſince the Souls of the people are truſted to him. As for the ſole power of Ordination and Juriſdiction, I am ſure none among us do claim it, but willingly allow the Presbyters a concurrence in both theſe. And as to what your friend ſaith of *Cyprian*, it is of a piece with the learning and ingenuity that runneth through the reſt of his Diſcourſe, *from page* 150 *to page* 160. where for divers pages he belabours his Reader with brave ſhews of Learning and high invention, ſo that no doubt he thinks he hath performed Wonders, and fully ſatisfied every ſcruple con-

concerning the riſe and progreſs of Epiſcopacy.

Iſot. I pray you, do not fly too high, and make not too much ado about any ſmall advantages you conceive you have of my Friend: but upon the whole matter I am willing to believe there was a precedency pretty early begun in the Church, which I ſhall not deny was uſeful and innocent, tho a deviation from the firſt pattern: Neither ſhall I deny, that holy men were of that Order: but when it is conſidered what a ſtep even that Precedency was to Lordly Prelacy, and how from that the *ſon of perdition* roſe up to his pretence of Supremacy; we are taught how unſafe it is to change any thing in the Church, from the firſt inſtitution of its bleſſed Head, who knew beſt what was fit for it, according to whoſe will all things in it ſhould be managed.

Poly. It hath been often repeated, that nothing was ever ſo ſacred, as to eſcape that to which all things, when they fall in the hands of Mortals, are obnoxious. And may not one that quarrels a ſtanding Miniſtery, argue on the ſame grounds, a Miniſters authority over the people, gave the riſe to the authority Biſhops pretend over Miniſters, and ſo the Miniſtery will be concluded the firſt ſtep of the Beaſt's Throne? Or may not the authority your Judi-

catories pretend to be at the ſame rate ſtruck out, ſince from leſſer Synods ſprung greater ones, from Provincial roſe Generals, and from theſe Oecumenical ones with the pretence of infallibility? But to come nearer you, that whole frame of *Metropolitans* and *Patriarchs* was taken from the diviſion of the *Roman Empire*, which made up but one great National Church: and ſo no wonder the Biſhop of the Imperial City of that *Empire*, was the *Metropolitan* of that Church: yet he was not all that neither, ſince he had no authority over his fellow *Patriarchs*, being only the firſt in order, which truly were the Biſhops of that Church: what they were for the firſt four Ages, it was never judged an abſurdity to grant to them ſtill: tho the ruin of the *Roman Empire*, and its diviſion into ſo many Kingdoms, which are conſtituted in various National Churches, do alter the preſent frame of *Europe* ſo entirely, from what was then; that with very good reaſon what was then ſubmitted to, on the account of the Unity of the *Empire*, may be now undone by reaſon of the ſeveral Kingdoms, which are National Churches within themſelves; and need not to own ſo much as the acknowledgment of Primacy to any, but to the *Metropolitan* of their own Kingdom. And it ſeems the intereſt of Princes, as well as Churches, to aſſert this. But for the pretence of the Pope's ſupremacy

macy, *Epiſcopacy* was ſo far from being judged a ſtep to it, that the ruin of the *Epiſcopal* authority over *Presbyters*, and the granting them exemptions from the Juriſdiction of their Ordinary, was the greateſt advance the *Roman Biſhop* ever made in his tyrannical uſurpation over Churches. I need not here tell ſo known a matter, as is that of the *exemption of the Regulars*, who being ſubject to their own Superiors and Generals, and by them to the Pope, were ſent through the World in ſwarms; and with great ſhews of piety, devotion, and poverty, carried away all the eſteem and following from the ſecular Clergy; who were indeed become too ſecular, and theſe were the Pope's *Agents* and *Emiſſaries*, who brought the World to receive the *mark of the Beaſt, and wonder at her.* For before that time, the Popes found more difficulty to carry on their pretenſions, both from ſecular Princes and Biſhops: But theſe Regulars being warranted to preach and adminiſter the Sacraments without the Biſhop's licenſe, or being ſubject and accountable to him; as they brought the Biſhops under great contempt, ſo they were the Pope's chief confidents in all their treaſonable plots againſt the Princes of *Europe*. And when at the *Council of Trent*, the Biſhops of *Spain* being weary of the inſolencies of the Regulars, and of the Papal yoak, deſigned to get

free from it. The great mean they propoſed, was to get *Epiſcopacy* declared to be of *divine Right*, which would have ſtruck out both the one and the other. But the Papal Party foreſaw this well, and oppoſed it with all the Artifice imaginable: and *Lainez* the Jeſuit, did at large diſcourſe againſt it; and they carried it ſo, that it was not permitted to be declared of *divine Right*. And by this, judg if it be likely that the Papacy owes its riſe to *Epiſcopacy*, ſince the declaring it to be of *divine Right*, was judged one of the greateſt blows the Papal Dominion could have received, as the abuſing of the *Epiſcopal* authority, was the greateſt ſtep to its Exaltation.

Iſot. Be in theſe things what may be, I am ſure *from the beginning it was not ſo*, ſince *Chriſt* did ſo expreſly prohibit all dominion and authority among his Diſciples, when he ſaid, *But it ſhall not be ſo among you: but whoſoever will be great among you, let him be your miniſter*, Luke 22. 26. Whereby he did not only condemn a tyrannical domination, but ſimply all Authority, like that the *Lords of the Gentiles exerciſed over them.* *See page* 88.

Crit. I confeſs, the advantages ſome have drawn from theſe words of CHRIST, for deciding this queſtion, have many times appeared ſtrange to me, their purpoſe being ſo viſibly

viſibly different from that to which they are applied. But if we examine the occaſion that drew theſe words from *CHRIST*, it will furniſh us with a key for underſtanding them aright: and that was the frequent contentions were among the Diſciples about the precedency in the Kingdom of *CHRIST*: for they were in the vulgar *Judaical Error*, who believed the *Meſſiah* was to be a temporal Prince, and ſo underſtood all the pompous promiſes of the *New Diſpenſation* liberally, and thought that *CHRIST* ſhould have reſtored *Iſrael* in the literal meaning: therefore they began to contend who ſhould be preferred in his Kingdom: and the Wife of *Zebedee* did early beſpeak the chief preferments for her Sons. Yea, we find them ſticking to this miſtake even at *CHRIST*'s Aſcenſion, by the queſtion then moved, concerning *his reſtoring the Kingdom at that time to Iſrael.* Now theſe Contentions, as they ſprung from an error of their judgments, ſo alſo they took their riſe from their proud ambition. And for a check to both, our Saviour anſwers them, by telling the difference was to be betwixt his Kingdom, and the Kingdoms of the Nations: theſe being exerciſed by Grandeur and temporal Authority, whereas his Kingdom was Spiritual, and allowed nothing of that; ſince Churchmen have not by *CHRIST* a Lordly or

Deſpotick dominion over Chriſtians committed to them, but a paternal and brotherly one; by which in commanding, they ſerve their Flock; ſo that it is both a *Miniſtery* and an *Authority*. Therefore the words of Chriſt, *it ſhall not be ſo among you*, relate nothing to the degrees or ranks of Churchmen, but to the nature of their power and juriſdiction over their flock, and not to their degrees among themſelves, which appears evidently from the whole contexture of the words. And that he is not ſpeaking of any equality among Churchmen in their Church power, appears from the mention is made of the *greateſt*, and *the chief*; *He that is greateſt among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth ſerve:* which ſhew he was not here deſigned to ſtrike out the degrees of ſuperiority, when he makes expreſs mention of them; but to intimate that the higher the degrees of *Eccleſiaſtical Offices* did raiſe them, they were thereby obliged to the more humility, and the greater labor. All which is evidently confirmed by the inſtance he gives of himſelf, which ſhews ſtill he is not meaning of Church power (ſince he had certainly the higheſt *Eccleſiaſtical authority*) but only of Civil dominion; nothing of which he would aſſume. And if this place be to be applied to Church power, then it will rather prove too much, that there ſhould be no

power

power at all among Churchmen over other Chriſtians: For ſince the parallel runs betwixt the Diſciples, and the Lords of the *Gentiles*; it will run thus, that tho the Lords of the *Gentiles* bear rule over their people, yet you muſt not over yours: ſo that this muſt either be reſtricted to *Civil Authority*, or elſe it will quite ſtrike out all *Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction*. But how this ſhould be brought to prove that there may not be ſeveral ranks in Church Offices, I cannot yet imagine. And as it is not thought contrary to this, that a Miniſter is over your Lay-Elders and Deacons, why ſhould it be more contrary to it, that a rank of Biſhops be over Miniſters? In a word, ſince we find the Apoſtles exerciſing this paternal authority over other Churchmen, it will clearly follow they underſtood not *Chriſt*, as hereby meaning to diſcharge the ſeveral ranks of Churchmen, with different degrees of power. But to tell you plainly what by theſe words of *CHRIST* is clearly forbidden, I acknowledg that chiefly the Pope's pretence to the *Temporal Dominion* over Chriſtendom, whether directly or indirectly, as the Vicar of *CHRIST*, is expreſly condemned. Next, all Churchmen under what notion, or in what Judicatory ſoever, are condemned, who ſtudy upon a pretence of the Churches intrinſick power, to poſſeſs themſelves of the authority, to determine about

about obedience due to Kings or Parliaments, and who bring a tyranny on the Christians, and procure what by Arts, what by Power, the secular Arm to serve at their beck. Whether this was the practice of the late *General Assemblies*, or not, I leave it to all who are so old, as to remember how squares went then; and if the leading Men at that time, had not really the secular power ready to lacquay at their commands, so that they ruled in the *spirit of the Lords of the Gentiles*, whatever they might have pretended. And the following change of Government did fully prove, that the obedience which was universally given to their commands, was only an appendage of the Civil Power, which was then directed by them: For no sooner was the power invaded by the *Usurper*, who regarded their Judicatories little, but the Obedience payed to their Decrees evanished. Thus, I say, these who build all their pretences to parity on their mistakes of these words, did most signally despise and neglect them in their true and real meaning. Now think not to retort this on any additions of *Secular Power*, which the munificence of Princes may have annexed to the *Episcopal* Office; for that is not at all condemned here: CHRIST speaking only of the power Churchmen, as such, derived from him their Head, which only bars all pretensions to *Civil Power*

Power on the title of their Functions; but doth not ſay that their Functions render them incapable of receiving any *Secular Power*, by a ſecular conveyance from the *Civil Magiſtrate*. And ſo far have I conſidered this great and pompous argument againſt precedency in the Church; and am miſtaken if I have not ſatisfied you of the ſlender foundations it is built upon: all which is alſo applicable to St. *Peter*'s words, of not *Lording it over their flocks*.

Iſot. You are much miſtaken, if you think that to be the great foundation of our belief of a parity among Churchmen, for I will give you another, (*page* 91.) which is this, that *JESUS CHRIST* the head of his Church, did inſtitute a ſetled Miniſtery in his Church, to feed and over-ſee the Flock, to preach, to reprove, to bind, looſe, &c. It is true, he gave the Apoſtles many ſingular things beyond their Succeſſors, which were neceſſary for that time, and work, and were to expire with it: But as to their Miniſterial Power which was to continue, he made all equal. The Apoſtles alſo acknowledged the Paſtors of the Churches, their fellow-laborors, and Brethren. And the feeding and overſeeing the Flock, are duties ſo complicated together, that it is evident none can be fitted for the one, without they have alſo authority for the other. And therefore all who have

have a power to preach, must also have a right to govern, since Discipline is referable to preaching, as a mean to its end: preaching being the great end of the Ministery. These therefore who are sent upon that work, must not be limited in the other: neither do we ever find *CHRIST* instituting a Superiour Order over preaching *Presbyters*, which shews he judged it not necessary: And no more did the Apostles, though they with-held none of the Counsel of *GOD* from the flock. Therefore this Superior Order usurping the power from the preaching Elders, since it hath neither warrant, nor institution in Scripture, is to be rejected, as an invasion of the rights of the Church. In fine, the great advantage our Plea for parity hath, is, that it proves its self, till you prove a disparity. For since you acknowledg it to be of *divine Right*, that there be Officers in the House of *GOD*, except you prove the institution of several Orders, an equality among them must be concluded. And upon these accounts it is that we cannot acknowledg the lawfulness of Prelacy.

Phil. I am sure, if your Friends had now heard you, they would for ever absolve you from designing to betray their cause by a faint Patrociny; since you have in a few words laid out all their Forces: but if you call to mind what hath

hath heen already ſaid, you will find moſt of what you have now pleaded, to be anſwered beforehand. For I acknowledge *Biſhop* and *Presbyter*, to be one and the ſame Office; and ſo I plead for no new Office-Bearers in the Church. Next, in our *ſecond Conference*, the power given to Churchmen was proved to be double. The firſt branch of it, is their Authority to publiſh the Goſpel, to manage the Worſhip, and to diſpenſe the Sacraments. And this is all that is of *divine right* in the Miniſtery, in which *Biſhops* and *Presbyters* are equal ſharers, both being veſted with this power. But beſide this, the Church claims a power of Juriſdiction, of making rules for diſcipline, and of applying and executing the ſame; all which is indeed ſuitable to the common Laws of *Societies*, and to the general rules of Scripture, but hath no poſitive warrant from any Scripture precept. And all theſe Conſtitutions of Churches into Synods, and the Canons of diſcipline, taking their riſe from the diviſions of the World into the ſeveral Provinces, and beginning in the end of the ſecond, and beginning of the third *Century*, do clearly ſhew they can be derived from no divine Original; and ſo were, as to their particular form, but of humane Conſtitution: therefore as to the management of this Juriſdiction, it is in the Churches power to caſt it in what mould

ſhe

ſhe will: and if ſo, then the conſtant practice of the Church for ſo many ages ſhould determine us, unleſs we will pretend to underſtand the exigencies and conveniences of it better than they who were neareſt the Apoſtolical time. But we ought to be much more determined by the *Laws of the Land*, which in all ſuch matters have a power to bind our conſciences to their obedience, till we prove the matter of them ſinful. Now diſcover where the guilt lyes of fixing one over a Tract of ground, who ſhall have the chief inſpection of the *Miniſtery*, and the greateſt Authority in matters of Juriſdiction, ſo that all within that Precinct be governed by him, with the concurring votes of the other *Presbyters*: if you ſay, that thereby the Miniſters may be reſtrained of many things, which otherwiſe the good of the Church requires to be done: I anſwer, theſe are either things neceſſary to be done by divine precept, or not: if the former, then ſince no power on earth can cancel the Authority of the *divine Law*, ſuch reſtraints are not to be conſidered. But if the things be not neceſſary, then the Unity and Peace of the Church is certainly preferable to them. I acknowledge a *Biſhop* may be tyrannical, and become a great burden to his *Presbyters*; but, pray, may not the ſame be apprehended from Synods? And remember your friends,

how

how long it is, ſince they made the ſame complaints againſt the Synods: and the hazard of an ill Biſhop is neither ſo fixed, nor ſo laſting, as that of a bad Synod. For a Biſhop may die, and a good one ſucceed: but when a Synod is corrupt, they who are the major part, are careful to bring in none, but ſuch as are ſure to their way; whereby they propagate their corruption more infallibly than a Biſhop can do. And what if the Lay ruling Elders ſhould bend up the ſame plea againſt the Miniſters, who do either aſſume *a Negative* over them directly, or at leaſt do what is equivalent, and carry every thing to the *Presbytery, Synod,* or *General Aſſembly,* where they are ſure to carry it againſt the Lay-Elders, they being both more in number, and more able with their learning and eloquence to confound the others? But ſhould a Lay-Elder plead thus againſt them, *We are Office-Bearers inſtituted by* CHRIST, *for ruling the flock, as well as you, and yet you take our power from us; for whereas in our Church Seſſions, which are of* CHRIST's *appointment, we are the greater number, being generally twelve to one; you Miniſters have got a device, to turn us out of the power: for you allow but one of us to come to your Synods, and Presbyteries, and but one of a whole Presbytery to go to a National Synod; whereby you ſtrike the reſt of us out of our power: and thus you aſſert a preeminence*

nence

nence over us, to carry matters as you please? Now *Isotimus*, when in your principles you answer this, I will undertake on all hazards to satisfie all you can say, even in your own principles. Next, may not one of the Congregational way, talk at the same rate, and say, *CHRIST hath given his Office-Bearers full power to preach, feed, and oversee the flock; and yet for all that, their power of overseeing is taken from them; and put in the hands of a multitude, who being generally corrupt themselves, and lusting to envy, will suffer none to outstrip them: but are tyrannical over any they see minding the work of the Gospel more than themselves? And must this usurpation be endured and submitted to?* And let me ask you freely, what imaginable device will be fallen upon, for securing the Church from the tyranny of Synods, unless it be either by the Magistrates power, or by selecting some eminent Churchmen, who shall have some degrees of power beyond their brethren? In a word, I deny not, but as in *Civil Governments*, there is no form upon which great inconveniences may not follow; so the same is unavoidable in *Ecclesiastical Government*. But as you will not deny, Monarchy to be the best of Governments, for all the hazards of tyranny from it; so I must crave leave to have the same impressions of *Episcopacy*.

Crit. But suffer me to add a little for checking

king *Isotimus* his too positive asserting of parity from the *New Testament*; for except he find a precept for it, his Negative Authority will never conclude it: and can only prove a parity lawful, and that imparity is not necessary. I shall acknowledge that without Scripture warrants, no new Offices may be instituted; but without that, in order to Peace, Unity, Decency, and Edification, several ranks and dignities in the same Office, might well have been introduced: whereby some were to be empowered either by the Churches choice, or the Kings Authority, as Overseers, or inspectors of the rest: who might be able to restrain them in the exercise of some parts of their functions, which are not immediatly commanded by *GOD*. And you can never prove it unlawful, that any should oversee, direct, and govern Churchmen, without you prove the Apostolical function unlawful: for what is unlawful, and contrary to the rules of the Gospel, can upon no occasion, and at no time become lawful: since then both the Apostles, and the Evangelists exercised Authority over *Presbyters*; it cannot be contrary to the Gospel rules, that some should do it. To pretend that this superiority was for that exigent, and to die with that age, is a mere allegation without ground from Scripture: for if by our *LORD*'s words, *it*

ſhall not be ſo among you, all ſuperiority among Churchmen was forbid, how will you clear the Apoſtles from being the firſt tranſgreſſors of it? And further, if upon that exigent ſuch ſuperiority was lawful, then upon a great exigent of the Church, a ſuperiority may be ſtill lawful. Beſides, it is aſſerted, not proved, that ſuch an authority as S. *Paul* left with *Timothy* and *Titus*, was to die with that age: for where the reaſon of an appointment continues, it will follow, that the Law ſhould alſo be coeval with the ground on which it was firſt enacted: if then there be a neceſſity that Churchmen be kept in order, as well as other Chriſtians; and if the more exalted their office be, they become the more ſubject to corruption, and corruptions among them be both more viſible, and more dangerous than they are in other perſons; the ſame parity of reaſon that enjoyns a Juriſdiction to be granted to Churchmen over the faithful, will likewiſe determine the fitneſs of granting ſome excreſcing power to the more venerable and approved of the Clergy over others; neither is this a new Office in the Houſe of *GOD*, but an eminent rank of the ſame Office.

Iſot. You ſtudy to preſent *Epiſcopacy* in as harmleſs a poſture as can be, yet that it is a diſtinct Office, is apparent by the ſole claim of *Ordi-*

Ordination and *Juriſdiction* they pretend to, and by their conſecration to it, which ſhews they account it a ſecond Order: beſides, that they do in all things carry as theſe who conceit themſelves in a Region above the *Presbyters*.

Phil. I am not to vindicate neither all the practices, nor all the pretenſions of ſome who have aſſerted this Order, no more than you will do the opinions or actings of all your party: which when you undertake, then I allow you to charge me with what you will. But it is a different thing to ſay, that no Ordination, nor greater act of Juriſdiction, ſhould paſs without the Biſhop's conſent, or concurrence (which is all I ſhall pretend to, and is certainly moſt neceſſary for preſerving of Order and Peace) from aſſerting that the ſole power for theſe ſtands in the Biſhops perſon. And though I do hold it ſchiſmatical to ordain without a Biſhop, where he may be had, yet I am not to annul theſe Ordinations that paſs from *Presbyters*, where no *Biſhop* can be had: and this lays no claim to a new Office, but only to a higher degree of inſpection in the ſame Office; whereby the exerciſe of ſome acts of *Juriſdiction* are reſtrained to ſuch a method; and this may be done either by the Churches free conſent, or by the King's authority. As for the conſecration of *Biſhops* by a new impoſition of hands, it doth not prove

them a distinct Office: being only a solemn benediction and separation of them for the discharge of that inspection committed to them: and so we find *Paul* and *Barnabas* (though before that they preached the Gospel, yet when they were sent on a particular Commission to preach to the gentiles) were blessed with imposition of hands, *Acts* 13. 3. which was the usual Ceremony of benediction. Therefore you have no reason to quarrel this, unless you apprehend their managing this oversight the worse, that they are blessed in order to it: nor can you quarrel the Office in the *Liturgy*, if you do not think they will manage their power the worse, if they receive a new effusion of the holy Ghost. And thus you see, how little ground there is, for quarrelling *Episcopacy* upon such pretences.

Eud. I am truly glad you have said so much for confirming me in my kindness for that *Government*: for if you evinces its lawfulness, I am sure the expediency of that Constitution will not be difficult to be proved, both for the tryal of Entrants, and the oversight of these in Office: for when any thing lyes in the hands of a multitude, we have ground enough to apprehend what the issue of it will prove. And what sorry overly things these tryals of Entrants are, all know. How little pains is taken to form their minds

minds into a right ſenſe of that function, to which they are to be initiated at one ſtep, without either previous degree, or mature tryal? And here I muſt ſay, the ruine of the Church ſprings hence, that the paſſage to ſacred Offices lyes ſo patent, whereby every one leaps into them out of a ſecular life, having all the train of his vanities, paſſions, and carnal deſigns about him: and moſt part entering thus unpurified, and unprepared, what is to be expected from them, but that they become idle, vain and licentious, or proud, ambitious, popular and covetous? I confeſs, things among us are not come to any ſuch ſettlement, as might give a proviſion againſt this: But deviſe me one like a *Biſhop's Authority*, who ſhall not confer Orders to any, before either himſelf, or ſome other ſelect and excellent perſons, on whom he may with confidence devolve that truſt, be well ſatisfied not only about the learning and abilities, but about the temper, the piety, the humility, the gravity, and diſcretion of ſuch as pretend to holy Orders: And that ſome longer tryal be taken of them by the *probationerſhip* of ſome previous degree. Indeed the poverty of the Church, which is not able to maintain Seminaries and Colledges of ſuch *Probationers*, renders this deſign almoſt impracticable. But ſtretch your thoughts as far as your invention can ſend

them, and ſee if you can provide ſuch an expedient for the reforming of ſo viſible an abuſe, as were the Biſhop's plenary authority to decide in this matter. For if it lie in the hands of a Plurality, the major part of theſe, as of all mankind, being acted by lower meaſures, the conſiderations of Kinred, alliance, friendſhip, or powerful recommendations, will always carry through perſons, be they what they will, as to their abilities and other qualifications: And a multitude of Churchmen is leſs concerned in the ſhame can follow an unworthy promotion; which every individual of ſuch a company will be ready to bear off himſelf, and faſten on the Plurality. But if there were one to whom this were peculiarly committed, who had authority to ſtop it, till he were clearly convinced that the perſon to be ordained, was one from whoſe labors good might be expected to the Church, he could act more roundly in the matter: and it may be preſuppoſed that his condition ſetting him above theſe low conſiderations, to which the inferiour Clergy are more obnoxious, he would manage it with more caution; as knowing that both before *GOD* and Man, he muſt bear the blame of any unworthy promotion.

And as for theſe in Office, can any thing be more rational than that the inſpection into their labors, their deportment, their converſation, and their

their dexterity in Preaching and Catechiſing, be not done mutually by themſelves in a party, wherein it is to be imagined, that as they degenerate, they will be very gentle to one another? And when any inſpection is managed by an equal, it opens a door to faction, envy, and emulation: neither are the private rebukes of an equal, ſo well received, nor will it be eaſie for one of a modeſt temper to admoniſh his fellow-Presbyter freely. And yet how many things are there, of which Churchmen have need to be admoniſhed, in the diſcharge of all the parts of their function, eſpecially when they ſet out firſt, being often equally void of experience and diſcretion? But what a remedy for all this, may be expected from an excellent Biſhop: who ſhall either, if his health and ſtrength allow it, be making excurſions through his Dioceſe, and himſelf obſerve the temper, the labors, and converſation of his Clergy? or at leaſt truſt this to ſuch as he hath reaſon to confide moſt in, that ſo he may underſtand what admonitions, directions, and reproofs are to be given, which might obviate a great many indiſcretions, and ſcandals that flow from Churchmen. And the authority of ſuch a perſon, as it would more recommend the reproofs to theſe for whom they were meant, ſo it could prevail to make them effectual, by a following Cenſure if

neglected. If the confuſion ſome keep matters in, have hindered us for coming at a deſired ſettlement, the Office of Epiſcopacy is not to be blamed, whoſe native tendency I have laid out before you, and in a fair *idea*, but in what was both the rule and practice of the ancient Church, and wants not latter inſtances for verifying it. In a word, I muſt tell you, I am ſo far from apprehending danger to the Church, from Biſhops having too much power, that I ſhall fear rather its ſlow recovery, becauſe they have too little: which might be managed with all the meekneſs and humility imaginable, and indeed ought to be always accompanied with the advice and concurrence of the worthieſt perſons among the inferior Clergy. But till you ſecure my fears of the greater part in all Societies becoming corrupt, I ſhall not ſay by the *major part* of them, but by the *better part*.

Iſot. I ſee you run a high ſtrain, and far different from what was the diſcourſe of this Countrey a year ago, of an accommodation was intended, wherein large offers ſeemed to be made: but I now ſee by your ingenuous freedom, that though for a while you (who were called a great friend to that deſign) were willing to yield up ſome parts of the Epiſcopal Grandeur, yet you retain the root of that Lordly ambition ſtill in your heart: and ſo though for ſome

ſome particular ends, either to deceive, or divide the LORDS people, you were willing to make an appearance of yielding; yet it was with a reſolution of returning with the firſt opportunity, to the old practices and deſigns of the Prelats, of enhanſing the Eccleſiaſtical Power to themſelves, and a few of their aſſociats. And this lets me ſee, what reaſon all honeſt people have to bleſs *GOD* that theſe arts and devices took not; *for an Ethiopian cannot change his skin.*

Phil. I confeſs to you freely, I was as little ſatisfied with theſe condeſcentions as any of you; and though they gave up the Rights of the Church to a peeviſh and preverſe party, whom gentleneſs will never gain: and therefore am no leſs ſatisfied than you are, that they did not take: and ſo much the more, that their refuſing to accept of ſo large offers, gave a new and clear character to the World of their temper: and that it is a faction, and the ſervile courting of a party which they deſign, and not a ſtrict adherence to the rules of conſcience, otherwiſe they had been more tractable.

Eud. Let me crave pardon to curb your humor a little, which ſeems too near a kin to *Iſotimus* his temper, though under a different character. For my part, I had then the ſame ſenſe of Epiſcopacy which I have juſt now owned. But when I conſidered the ruines of Religion

ligion, which our diviſions occaſioned among us, and when I read the large offers S. *Auguſtin* made on the like occaſion to the *Donatiſts*, I judged all poſſible attempts even with the largeſt condeſcentions for an accommodation, a worthy and pious deſign, well becoming the gravity and moderation of a Biſhop to offer, and the nobleneſs of theſe in authority to ſecond with their warmeſt endeavors: for if it was bleſſed with ſucceſs, the effect was great, even the ſetling of a broken and divided corner of the Church: if it took not, as it fully exonered the Church of the evils of the Schiſm; ſo it rendered the enemies of Peace and Unity the more unexcuſable. Only I muſt ſay this upon my knowledg, that whatever deſigns men of various ſentiments faſtened upon that attempt, it was managed with as much ingenuity and ſincerity, as mortals could carry along with them in any purpoſe. I know it is expected and deſired that a full account of all the ſteps of that affair be made publick, which a friend of ours drew up all along, with the progreſs of it. But at preſent my concern in one, whom a late Pamphlet, (as full of falſhoods in matters of fact, as of weakneſs in point of reaſon) hath mirepreſented (*the caſe of Accommodation, Page* 31) ſhall prevail with me to give an account of a particular paſſed in a Conference, which a Biſhop and

and two Presbyters had with about thirty of the *Nonconformists*, at *Pasley*, on the 14th of *December* in the year 1670. When the Bishop had in a long Discourse recommended Unity and Peace to them, on the terms were offered; he withal said much to the advantage of Episcopacy as he stated it, from the rules and practices of the ancient Church: offering to turn their Proselyte immediately, if they should give him either clear Scripture, good reason or warrant from the most Primitive Antiquity against such Episcopacy. And with other things, he desired to know whether they would have joined in Communion with the Church, at the time of the Council of *Nice*, (to carry them no higher) or not? for if they refused that, he added he would have less heartiness to desire communion with them, since of these he might say, *Let my soul be with theirs.* But to that, a general answer was made by one, who said, He hoped they were not looked upon, as either so weak, or so wilful, as to determine in so great a matter, but upon good grounds: which were the same, that the asserters of Presbyterian Government had built on, which they judged to be conform both to Scripture and Primitive Antiquity. But for Scripture, neither he nor any of the meeting offered to bring a Title: only he alledged some differences betwixt the ancient Presidents, as he called

called them, and our Biſhops. But this was more fully enlarged by one who is believed to be among the moſt learned of the Party: whoſe words with the anſwer given them, I ſhall read to you, as I take both from a Journal was drawn of that affair, by one whoſe exactneſs and fidelity in it, can be atteſted by ſome worthy ſpectators, who read what he wrote after the Meeting was ended, and Judged it not only faithful, but often verbal: And that he was ſo careful to evite the appearances of partiality, that he ſeemed rather ſtudious to be more copious in propoſing what was ſaid by theſe who differed from his opinion, whereas he contracted much of what was ſaid by theſe he favored. The account follows.

Mr. —— *ſaid, That he offered to make appear, the difference was betwixt the preſent Epiſcopacy, and what was in the ancient Church, in five particulars. The firſt was, that they had no* Archbiſhops *in the Primitive Church. It is true, they had* Metropolitans; *but in a Council of* Carthage, *it was decreed, that no Biſhop ſhould be called* Summus Sacerdos, *or* Princeps Sacerdotum, ſed primæ ſedis Epiſcopus. 2. *The Biſhops in the ancient Church were Parochial, and not only* κατὰ πόλιν, *but in every Village* κατὰ κώμην; *for even in* Bethany *we find there was a Biſhop.* 3. *Two Biſhops might be in one Church, ſuch was* (*not to mention* Alexan-

Alexander *and* Narciſſus *at* Jeruſalem) Auguſtin, *who with* Valerius, *was ordained Biſhop of* Hippo. 4. *Biſhops were elected by their Preſbyters, ſo* Jerome *tells us, that in* Alexandria *the Preſbyters chooſed one of their number to be Biſhop: and finally, the Biſhops were countable to and cenſurable by their Presbyters: for either this muſt have been, otherwiſe they could not have been cenſured at all. For though we meet with ſome Provincial Synods in Church Hiſtory, as that of* Carthage *in* Cyprians *time, for the rebaptizing of hereticks; and that at* Antioch *againſt* Samoſatenus, *yet theſe inſtances were rare, and recurred ſeldom; therefore there muſt have been a power in Preſbyters to have cenſured their Biſhops, otherwiſe it could not have been done, which is abſurd to imagine. And upon all theſe accounts, he judged the preſent Epiſcopacy differed much from the ancient* αὐτουσία.

Upon this diſcourſe, the Biſhop being weary of ſpeaking much, looked to one of his Presbyters, whom that Pamphlet in deriſion, calls, *a worthy Doctor:* who ſaid, *He found the ancient writings were ſo clear for a diſparity among Churchmen, and ſo full of it, that he was aſſured none could doubt it, after he had looked but overly upon them: But as to what was alledged, he firſt aſſumed the five particulars, and ſpoke to them in order. To the firſt, he ſaid, It was true, the term* Archbiſhop, *was not uſed in the firſt Centuries: but in the Council of* Nice,

Nice, *mention is not only made of* Metropolitans; *but the Canon ſaith of them,* τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, let the ancient cuſtoms have their force: *which ſhews the ſuperiority of* Metropolitans *to have been pretty early begun. And the Canon that was cited, calling him,* Primæ Sedis Epiſcopum, *makes him Primate: now we are not to contend about words, when the thing is clear: neither will any* Archbiſhop *judg himſelf injured, if inſtead of that name, he be called* Metropolitan, *or* Primate. *Beſides,* Archiepiſcopus, *doth not import* Prince of the Biſhops; *but that he is the chief and firſt of them. And this prefixing of* ἀρχὴ *to* ὄνομα, *was not ſo odious: for* Nazianzen *calls a Biſhop* ἀρχιερεῖς, *and the* Areopagite ἱεραρχὰς.

For the ſecond particular, it is true, Biſhops were in many places very thick ſet; for in S. Auguſtin's *time it appears from the journals of a Conference he had with the* Donatiſts, *that there were about* 500. *Biſhopricks in a ſmall tract of ground, but this was not univerſal: for* Theodoret *tells he had* 800. *Pariſhes in his Dioceſe: and* Sozomen *tells of great Countries where there were very few Biſhops. And to prove this, the Canons of* Ancyra *make a difference betwixt the Presbyters of the Country from thoſe of the City: and over the former there was a* Chorepiſcopus; *which ſhews that the whole Dioceſe was not within the City. But this was not much to our purpoſe, ſince the* more or the leſs did not

vary

vary the kind. *And if a Biſhop might be over the Miniſters of the City, it cannot be unlawful that he be likewiſe ſet over more in the Country: which can be no more eſſential to this matter, than it is, whether a Pariſh be great or ſmall. So that this difference may well make the one unexpedient, but unlawful it cannot be, if the other be lawful.*

For the third particular, there was a Canon of the Council of Nice, *that there might be* but one Biſhop in a City. *And he was amazed to hear the inſtance of S.* Auguſtin *alledged, who was indeed ordained Coadjutor to* Valerius; *but himſelf in his* 110. Epiſt. *condemns that, telling that he did it ignorantly, not knowing it to be contrary to the* Nicene Rules: *And therefore he tells how he deſigned* Eradius *to be his Succeſſor, but would not ordain him in his own time, becauſe of that Canon. Other inſtances of more Biſhops in one City, might have been more pertinently adduced to this purpoſe: but they were either Coadjutors, ſuch as* Nazianzen *the ſon was to his father, or it was agreed to for ſetling a Schiſm, as was done in the Schiſm betwixt* Meletius *and* Paulinus *of* Antioch. *And ſo S.* Auguſtin *and the* African *Biſhops with him, offered to the* Donatiſts, *that would they agree with them, theſe ſchiſmatical Biſhops ſhould be continued as conjunct Biſhops with thoſe already ſetled in thoſe Sees where they lived. It is true, ſome will have both* Linus *and* Clemens *to have ſucceeded S.* Peter *at* Rome, *and* Evodius *and* Ignatius *to*

have

have ſucceeded him at Antioch: *But for this, none aſſert that both ſucceeded to* S. Peter; *ſome being for one, and ſome for another: and ſo in a hiſtorical matter, the teſtimonies of theſe who lived neareſt that time ſhould decide the queſtion. But the* Conſtitutions *of* Clemens *offer a ſolution to this, that at firſt there were in ſome Cities two Churches, one for thoſe of the* Circumciſion, *and another for thoſe of the* Uncircumciſion: *and after the deſtruction of* Jeruſalem, *this diſtinction was ſwallowed up. This is rational, and not without ground in Scripture: beſides, that that Book, though none of* Clements, *yet is ancient. And from all this it was clear, that there might be but one Biſhop in a City.*

As for the fourth particular, it is true, the ancient elections of Biſhops *and* Presbyters *were partly by* Synods, *partly by* Presbyters, *and partly popular. But as none would ſay it made any eſſential alteration of the* Conſtitution *of a Church, if inſtead of theſe elections,* Patrons *had now a right of preſenting to Churches; ſo though inſtead of theſe elections the King were* Patron *of all the Biſhopricks, it did not alter the nature of* Epiſcopacy, *much leſs juſtifie a Schiſm againſt it. But beſide this, it was known the Capitular elections were ſtill continued.*

And for the fifth particular, he deſired they might give one inſtance in all Antiquity, where a Biſhop was cenſured by Presbyters: it being clear that they could finiſh nothing without the Biſhops ſentence, μηδὲν ἐπιτε-

ἐπιτελεῖσθαι ἄνευ γνώμης ἐπισκόπου, *was the words of the Canon: And if they could finish nothing without the Bishop, much less could they censure himself.* Provincial Synods *were begun in the second* Century, *which appears from many* Synods *were held about the day of observing* Easter. *Another expedient they had, when a Bishop was heretical, that the neighboring Bishops used to publish it in their* Cicular Letters, *which went around, and so they did excommunicate or depose them. But the regular way of procedure against Bishops was in* Provincial Synods, *which were now offered to be set up. Yet even this exception could be no ground for separating, no more than in their principles Lay Elders had to separate from their Ministers, who were their fixed President, and yet did not judge themselves censurable by these Lay Elders; tho as to the power of ruling, they held them to be equal.* With this he ended, saying, *He had now proposed what occurred of a sudden to his thoughts on these heads, though he believed much more might be adduced; but he supposed there was enough said to clear these particulars.* And it seems the Person who had engaged him to this, judged so; since neither he, nor any of his brethren, offered a reply. And by this account (of the truth whereof I am willing all there present bear witness) let the company judge of the ingenuity of these Writers. But I shall pursue the discourse of the accommodation no further.

Basil. I am sure it hath left this conviction on all our Consciences, that that Party is obstinately fixed to their own humors, without the least color of reason. But now, I think, enough is said for justifying both the lawfulness and usefulness of Episcopacy, and that there is nothing in it contrary either to the nature or rules of the Gospel, or of right Reason. And for any occasional evils may have risen from the restitution of this Government, they are with no justice to be fastened on it. I know, many accuse their revenues and honors, thus *the spirit that is in us lusteth to envy:* and the eyes of many are evil, because the eyes of our pious Progenitors were good. But indeed the ravenous Appetites of some *Ostriches* among us, have swallowed down so much of the Churches Patrimony, that what remains of it, can scarce provoke envy. And truly Churchmen bestowing their Revenues well, for Alms-deeds, relieving the Widows and Orphans, and such modest hospitality and decency, as may preserve them from the disesteem of the vulgar, who measure their value of men much from these externals, there were no ground of quarrelling at them were their riches seven-fold increased. I am far from the thoughts of patronizing the *German* Bishops, on whom I look as the disgrace of that Order, who live in all things like other Princes, making Wars, and leading

leading out Armies: nor do they once conſider their Dioceſes, or what they owe them as Biſhops, being wholly immerſed in ſecular affairs. But for all this, I cannot ſee cauſe for blaming Churchmen, their being either upon the publick Councils of the Kingdom in Parliaments, or on His Majeſties Secret Councils, and that both becauſe Eccleſiaſtical matters are often in agitation, both in the one, and the other, in which none are ſo properly to be adviſed with as Churchmen. Occaſion may alſo be frequently given to thoſe who ſhould be preſuppoſed to underſtand the rules of equity and conſcience beſt, to lay them before others, who either know them not, or mind them too little: And finally, they are Subjects, as well as others, and by the clearneſs is to be expected in their Judgments, and the calmneſs of their minds, together with their abſtracted and contemplative manner of life, they may upon occaſions be very prudent Counſellors: And why a Prince ſhall be deprived of the Councils of that which ſhould be the wiſeſt and beſt part of his Kingdom, no reaſon can be given. But for all this, I acknowledge there is great hazard from humane Infirmity, leſt by ſuch medling they be too much intangled in matters extrinſick to them, whereby their thoughts may be drawn out from that inward, ſerene, and abſtracted temper

wherein their minds ſhould be preſerved; both for more ſpiritual Contemplation, and for a more cloſe purſuing the work of the Goſpel, which ought ſtill to be their chief labor. But I muſt touch this ſtring no more, leſt you ſay that *the Fox preacheth*, and methinks our diſcourſe is now near its period.

Iſot. A great many things do yet remain which are untouched, and deſerve to be better conſidered: for theſe crude Dialogues poured out a great deal of ſtuff, which it is like the writer never examined: And in theſe, you who are his friends, muſt either vindicate him, or leave him to the mercy of every ſevere cenſurer.

Eud. His temper is well enough known to us, that he is very little ſollicitous about the eſteem or cenſures of men: and therefore, if all the particulars in his Book, cannot maintain themſelves to the judgments of rational and unprepoſſeſſed Readers, he thinks them not worthy of his Patrociny. And for that little trifling way of writing, by tracing every word in a Book, or of making good all a man hath ſaid, it is a task equally mean, unpleaſant, and laborious: and looks like one contending for victory more than truth. Were it a worthy thing for us to go and reckon how often *and* comes about in any of that Pamphleteers long periods, or how often he writes falſe Grammar, how

how harſh his Phraſes, and how tedious his Periods are? or make other ſuch like remarks: Alas, did we that, there were no end! and yet ſuch like are many of his reflections. But then how beautiful were our diſcourſe, if interwoven with thoſe elegancies of *poor wretch, babler, impertinent, confident, ignorant, atheiſt, ſcoffer*, and many more of that ſame ſtrain? I know well enough why he uſed thoſe, his deſign being to make his gentle and ſimple *Readers* ſtand gravely, and turn up the white, and look pale, and affrighted with all thoſe black Imputations he charges on that *poor wretch*. Methinks I hear the cenſures of the herd, when they firſt read over his Book, to this purpoſe: *Oh, here is a worthy piece, full of deep learning; and believe me, he ſpeaks home: he is a ſweet man that wrote it, he he who he will, and was marvellouſly born through in it all. And oh, but it is ſeaſonable! and well timed: for he hath anſwered the whole Book to a word. And where we thought it ſtrongeſt, he ſhews its weakneſs moſt. But I wiſh the poor wretch repentance, yet it is a proud Companion, and full of diſdain; but I hope he is humbled for once: it were a pity of him, for they ſay he hath ſome abilities: but they are all wrong ſet: and he will, may be, ſtudy to heal the beaſt of the wound, which one of our Champions hath given it; but had he any ſparks of grace, I could yet love him for his good* ——— *ſake.*

It were a worthy attempt to go and ſatisfie ſuch a gang of Cattle: therefore the cavils on the fifth and ſixth Dialogue are ſo poor, that it were loſt time to conſider them; and ſo groundleſs, that he who from reading over the Dialogues themſelves, is not able to withſtand all thoſe tricks of Sophiſtry, would be little bettered by all we could add: and therefore we may well quit the Theme, and that the rather, that we have examined all that is of publick concern in theſe debates: and for any thing that was ſtarted, which lies out of the way, we will leave the diſcuſſing of theſe to the Conformiſt himſelf; ſince our deſign in this *Conference* was to get mutual ſatisfaction to our Conſciences, in theſe things which the Laws enjoin: and if we have gained this, we are to leave contending about other things, which relate not to us. Only if in theſe greater points it be found that what the Conformiſt ſaid in the Dialogues, was grounded on ſo much clear and ſtrong reaſon, as we have diſcovered ſince our firſt meeting; it is to be preſumed that in other things he was not ſo raſh or irrational as to utter ſuch abſurdities or errors, as the late Pamphlets do charge upon him.

Phil. Our work was to conſider, whether abſolute ſubjection was due to the Civil Authority, and how far its dominion over our obedience

did

did reach, and whether the Principles and Practices of the late times, had ſuch evident characters of GOD's acceptance on them, that it was an unpardonable crime to reverſe that building, which they prepared with ſo much noiſe, and cemented with ſo much blood; and by conſequence whether Epiſcopacy was *that accurſed thing* which provoked GOD's Jealouſie ſo much againſt us, that it was unlawful to unite with it, or ſo far to comply with its adherents as to unite with them in Worſhip? If theſe things be made clear to us, we need not amuſe our ſelves, nor entertain one another with farther janglings, and therefore may break off our *Conference.*

Iſot. Since you will break off, I ſhall not ſtruggle about it: for it is a confeſſion of your weakneſs, that you paſs over ſo many things with this ſlight ſilence.

Baſil. This is the genuine Spirit of the party which you now expreſs to the life; but whenever the Author of the Dialogues undergoes the penance of examining what you deſire, it will perhaps appear, you have as little ground for this as for your other boaſting. But I am ſure no ſcruple ſticks with me about theſe great heads we have examined, ſo that upon a narrow ſurvey of theſe matters, it appears he had more reaſon for what he aſſerted, than he then vented:

And I have as little doubt of his being able to clear himſelf about other matters, which are ſnarled at by theſe Pamphlets. But one thing I have not forgot, about which I am more ſollicitous: which was a promiſe *Polybiſtor* made of ſending when our *Conference* were ended, an account of the model and forms of the ancient Government: which I deſire with ſuch earneſtneſs, that I wiſh we were gone, that he might be as good as his word.

Poly. I know not if it ſhall anſwer your hopes, but your curioſity ſhall be quickly ſatisfied, after I have given you ſome account of my deſign in it. When I conſidered the ruines of Religion, and the decays of Piety through the World, I have often bent my thoughts to ſeek out the moſt proper remedies and means for the Churches recovery: and that which ſeemed the moſt promiſing, was to conſider the conſtitution, the rites and forms of the Church in her firſt and pureſt ages; and to obſerve the ſteps of their declining from the primitive ſimplicity and purity, which being once fully done, great materials would be thereby congeſted for many uſeful thoughts, and overtures in order to a Reformation. And this is a work, which for all the accurate enquiries this age hath produced, is not yet performed to any degree of perfection, or ingenuity: therefore I reſolved to purſue this

this deſign as much as my leiſure and other avocations could allow of. But as I was doubtful what method to follow in digeſting my obſervations, the Canons vulgarly called Apoſtolical, offered themſelves to my thoughts: I thereupon reſolved to follow their tract, and to compile ſuch hints as I could gather on my way for giving a clear view of the ſtate of the Church in the firſt ages. As for the opinions of the ancient Fathers, theſe have been ſo copiouſly examined by the Writers of Controverſies, that ſcarce any thing can be added to thoſe who went before us: bet few have been at ſuch pains for ſearching into their practices, and rules for Diſcipline, and Worſhip, wherein their excellency and ſtrength lay. In this inquiry I have now made good advances, but at preſent I will only ſend you my Obſervations on the two firſt Canons: and as you ſhall find this task hath ſucceeded with me, I will be encouraged to break it off, or to purſue it farther. Only on the way, let me tell you, that I am ſo far from thinking theſe Canons, Apoſtolical, that nothing can be more evident, than that they were a collection made in the Third *Century* at ſooneſt: for the matter of almoſt every Canon diſcovers this when well examined, and therefore that Epiſtle of *Zepherinus* the Pope, who lived about the year 20 , that mentions 60 (or as others cite

it

it 70.) of the Apoſtles ſayings, is not to be conſider'd: that Epiſtle with the other *Decretals*, being ſo manifeſtly ſpurious, that it cannot be doubted by any who reads them: and the number ſixty agrees with no Edition; for they are either fifty or 85. *Tertullian* is alſo cited for them, but the words cited as his, are not in his Book *contra Praxeam*, from which they are vouched. Nor can they be called the work of *Clemens Romanus*, though they were vented under his name. For *Athanaſius* in his *Synopſis*, reckons the work of *Clemens Apocryphal*. And *Euſebius* tells us that nothing aſcribed to *Clement* was held genuine, but his Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*. But the firſt Publiſhers of theſe who lived, it is like in the Third *Century*, have called them Apoſtolical, as containing the earlieſt rules which the Apoſtolical men had introduced in the Church. And afterwards others to conciliate more veneration for them, called them the Canons of the Apoſtles, compiled by *Clement*. And this drew *Pope Gelaſius*'s cenſure on them, by which the Book of the Canons of the Apoſtles is declared Apocryphal: which ſome who aſſert their authority and antiquity, would fooliſhly evite, by applying that cenſure only to the 35. added Canons: whereas the cenſure is ſimply paſſed on the Book, and not on any additions to it. And this ſhall ſerve for an Introduction to the

Papers

Papers I will ſend you how ſoon I get home.

Phil. I doubt not but all of us, except *Iſotimus*, will be very deſirous to underſtand the particular forms of the Primitive Church: but he is ſo ſure, that they will conclude againſt him, that I believe he is not very curious of any ſuch diſcovery.

Iſot. You are miſtaken, for I doubt not, but much will be found among the Ancients for me; but if otherwiſe, I will lead you a ſtep higher, to let you ſee that from the beginning it was not ſo: For Antiquity, when againſt Scripture, proves only the error ancient. And if you quit the Scriptures to us, we will yield thoſe muſty Records to you.

Eud. Pray, ſpeak not ſo confidently, after all your pretences have been ſo baffled, that we are aſhamed of you: for you are like the *Spaniard*, who retained his ſupercilious Looks and Gate, when he was ſet to beg. But I will not be rude in a place which owns me for its Maſter, though really your confidence extorts it.

Iſot. You are a proud company, and ſo elevated in your own eyes, that you deſpiſe all who differ from you, and think you cenſure them gently, if you call them no worſe than ignorants and fools. Is there any arrogance in the World like this?

Phil. Pray, let us not fall out, now that we are

are to part: but I confeſs it is no wonder the ſmart of all the foils you have got, provoke ſome paſſion in you, and ſo I pity you; for I know none of your Party who would have carried ſo diſcreetly. Therefore, Adieu, I muſt be gone, and leave this good company.

Iſot. You will have the laſt word of ſcolding, but I perhaps will find out one that will be too hard for you all, and will call you to account of all you have both argued and boaſted.

Baſil. I will break off next, ſince the deſign of your meeting is finiſhed; only, *Polyhiſtor*, mind your promiſe.

Poly. I go about it, and therefore, *Eudaimon*, I beg your pardon to be gone.

Eud. Though Retirement and Solitude be ever acceptable to me, yet it will not be without ſome pain that I return to it, when I miſs ſo much good company, as have relieved me theſe four days: but the truth is, on the other hand, I am glad to ſee an end put to this painful Engagement of which I ſuppoſe we are all weary. It remains only that I return you my ſincere and hearty thanks for the favor you have done me, which I wiſh I could do ſo warmly, as might engage you frequently to oblige me with the like civilities. Adieu, my good friends.

F I N I S.